

The Era of McCarthyism

An examination, pro and con, of certain
of the leading ideas and ideologues during
the heyday of the late Senator McCarthy.

(First published as *History And Reality*)

by HERBERT APTHEKER

With an Introduction by
PROFESSOR ROBERT S. COHEN
Chairman, Department of Physics
Boston University

HERBERT APTHEKER

The Era of Mc Carthyism

First Published as History and Reality

& Marzani
Munsell, INC. *Publishers, New York, N.Y.*

TO V. J. JEROME

IMPRISONED TEACHER

Copyright, 1955 by Herbert Aptheker

FIRST EDITION, 1955

PROMETHEUS EDITION, 1962

All rights reserved. No part of this book in excess of five hundred words may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States

Contents

Introduction, by Professor Robert S. Cohen	6
1. HISTORY AND REALITY	17
2. POLEMICS ON THE "NEW CONSERVATISM"	
Walter Lippmann and Democracy	49
The Cadillac Credo of David Riesman	73
Communism and Truth: A Reply to Sidney Hook	89
A Neo-Confederate View of the Confederacy	104
The Filthy Rich	109
3. POLEMICS ON THE LIBERAL ILLUSION	
The Schlesinger Fraud	115
Civil Rights and the Liberals	130
McCarthyism and the Liberals	140
Is Freedom an Illusion?	156
4. POLEMICS ON POLICIES OF REACTION	
Reading between the Lies: The Anti-Soviet Experts	167
"Old Friends" of China	184
Franco and American Morality	203
Marx and American Scholarship	211
5. POLEMICS ON CLASS JUSTICE	
Behind the Hiss Frameup	221
Taking the Stand	238
The Informer System and Justice	246
Two Hangings on Guam	253
Notes from North Carolina	279
Index	289

By Herbert Aptheker:

The Negro in the Civil War (1938)

Negro Slave Revolts in the U.S. (1939)

The Negro in the American Revolution (1940)

The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement (1941)

American Negro Slave Revolts (1943)

Essays in the History of the Negro People (1945)

The Negro People in America (1946)

To Be Free: Studies in American Negro History (1948)

A Documentary History of the Negro People in the U.S. (1951)

America's Racist Laws (1952)

Laureates of Imperialism (1954)

The Labor Movement in the South During Slavery (1955)

The World of C. Wright Mills (1961)

Dare We Be Free (1961)

Preface to the Second Edition

Naturally, it is gratifying to learn from the publisher of this book that continuing demand for it justifies a second printing. I have chosen to make no changes; this choice does not reflect a feeling that everything in it, as it now stands, reflects precisely my views, either of "history" or of "reality," as of 1962. Still what changes there have been in those views are not so substantial that I should feel compelled to apologize for or to alter their expression now.

Aside from the first essay, which attempts an exposition of the writer's philosophical outlook — and *that* has not changed — what usefulness in general the volume may have surely stems from its description and evaluation of issues and ideas raised in the fire of the battle against McCarthyism. That has its own historical interest, no doubt; in addition, alas, the question is not simply historical, for the ghost of Senator McCarthy — and more than his ghost — haunts the United States in the form of un-American Committees, Subversive Activities Control Boards, McCarran Acts, Birch Societies, and so forth.

Mr. Sidney Hook still holds forth, in the *N. Y. Times Magazine* pages and in *The New Leader* and in other splendid "Free World" organs, as to the diabolical quality of the "Reds," Mr. Schlesinger, Jr., has changed his residence from Cambridge to Washington but his essential commitment — to save capitalism — remains staunch and he will hold to it though he must support invasions in the Bay of the Pigs and chemical warfare in South Vietnam.

John Gates, having served his time in prison and having changed his political views, has wandered off to quieter pursuits. Junius Scales has also altered his political opinions. Because he refused to besmirch his own past or to befoul his own humanity by turning informer for the government, his conviction under the Smith Act has been upheld. He is now well along in serving the vindictive six-year prison term meted out to him.

At the time, the author was proud that his volume would be enhanced with an introduction from Professor Robert S. Cohen — now Chairman of the Department of Physics at Boston University — and this pride remains. The questions and dissenting views he expressed in that introduction were challenging when made in 1955; I think their challenge and pertinence have increased with the passing of the years.

February, 1962

INTRODUCTION

(1)

Herbert Aptheker is an historian and a Communist. The Marxist hypothesis of historical materialism provides, he says, a "frame of reference which holds in place coherently and meaningfully the total mass of the ascertainable past, or more of it than any other." In this volume of essays, Aptheker has applied to the contemporary scene the tools of the historical scholar and of the Communist.

Most Americans disagree with the socialist reasoning that the abolition of private ownership of productive property will eliminate poverty and inequalities. Above all, most of us repudiate the Communist Party as the means by which a more decent social order may be constructed. Nevertheless, deep in our national life, we can find a spirit of radical social criticism like that which animates Aptheker's work; and along with criticism, there are in our history proposals for complete transformation of the nation's economic order. American radicalism has its anarchism in Thoreau, its class struggle in Debs, its defiant organization in the Abolitionists, its passionate protest against established social injustices in a host of muckrakers.

We can place Herbert Aptheker as an American Communist within the national heritage of radical dissent; we can also see him as part of an international movement. That Aptheker's Marxist conceptions came originally from abroad is not particularly relevant to their appraisal. The German, Marx, drew upon English economics, French politics, German philosophy, and the humanism of Judaism and Christianity, and his followers have added lessons from Russia and China. We each can say much the same for our own views, be they matters of politics or religion or the customs of daily life. I suggest therefore that we refrain from concluding that views which are alien in their genesis are thereby un-American—by which I suppose we mean, if we mean anything at all, inapplicable to American conditions.

But that characteristic of Communism which is so different from traditional American radicalism is the international orientation. Here is a problem for Aptheker's readers to muse upon. The rational analysis of the American scene that serves to buttress Aptheker's topical essays is essentially the same as that which

Marxists hold of other nations and cultures; it is cross-national and intrinsically international. Likewise, the vision of a better tomorrow, which the Communist sees, is not a specifically American vision. It too is international. There is an older view according to which America was to serve as a model for other peoples. Is American Communism a radically new dissent according to which America has no unique salvation nor Americans a unique mode of social reasoning?

Aptheker writes, then, not only within an American tradition of dissent, and concern for justice, but with intellectual equipment new to that tradition, adding, to exposé and popular pressure, the Marxist method of causal analysis. There are, to my mind, other reasonable approaches to history than Marxism, and there are other components to morality than justice, but *the point I am making is that the America of the Cold War has denied both that Communism is reasoned and that a Communist can be moral. It is time that we questioned this view. We need to test the reasoning and judge the morality of those intelligent men and women who have become persuaded of the Communist way.*

(2)

Aptheker is an American historian, professionally concerned with the facts and meanings of American history. He was born in Brooklyn in 1915, educated in the New York City public schools, earned his B.S. at Columbia University, and proceeded to a doctor's degree there, with a dissertation on *American Negro Slave Revolts* (Columbia University Press, 1943). He entered the Army as a private in the Second World War, and served four years in the field artillery, ending his military career with the rank of major. He has been a Guggenheim Fellow and a frequent contributor of research in Negro history to scholarly periodicals. His principal research effort was published as *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States* (Citadel Press, 1951).

Dr. Aptheker's competence is well established. William E. B. Du Bois wrote that the *Documentary History* was "painstaking and thorough . . . a milestone on the road to Truth" and Dean Harry Carman of Columbia called the doctoral dissertation a masterpiece.

Aptheker is an active Communist, a frequent spokesman, an expert witness at several trials of Communists indicted under the Smith Act, a writer for the Marxist magazines *Masses & Mainstream* and *Political Affairs*. Many American scholars stress non-participation in public affairs but others have become active in public life. Like the historians Bancroft and Beard, Aptheker has entered political controversy; and, with these and such others as Commager and

Nevins and Becker, he has often left his research specialty to offer commentary on present issues. It is not unlikely that in a more tolerant time a scholar of Aptheker's distinction and influence would hold a university professorship of Negro history.

(3)

The reader will find in these essays four major themes: first, the objective nature and causal relatedness of historical facts; second, the Marxist interpretation of these facts, historical materialism; third, application of that interpretation to specific events, especially to the writings of influential thinkers; fourth, the union of understanding, morality, and activity.

Written as occasional essays, they show the scars of battle and the heat of passion. Aptheker has combined analysis, interpretation, and partisan inspiration. Here, I believe, is the connection between the essays and Dr. Aptheker's historical researches. They fuse scholarship and politics, focusing upon what he feels is a shocking state of public ignorance.

Now any defender of democracy will be alarmed if the citizenry is misinformed or not informed about policies or social facts. What Aptheker brings to our attention is that ignorance of ourselves and of our society is an illness and a danger. He asks, in a memorable image, "How shall the victim of amnesia fend for himself—and in a hostile world?" As historian, he seeks to bring knowledge to bear on the problems of today by revealing the greatness and humanity of the oppressed of yesterday. Without knowledge of yesterday, we believe the slanders of today, even about ourselves. We are left rootless and ashamed; we are isolated from our fellow-Americans, our fellow human beings, disrespectful of them and of ourselves.

Aptheker's idea of the social role of historical study is especially pertinent to Negro history. Now, in the present volume, the goals of his research on the Negro are sought again in a new context. The purpose of these essays can be put in simple terms: to battle the slanders of ignorance, cowardice, deceit, and self-righteousness.

Of course, the pot often calls the kettle black. Self-righteousness is frequently a fault of those who proclaim it a sin. At times the reader may wonder whether the merits of Aptheker's exposure of others are matched by the defects of his own partisanship. He asks, correctly, how such scholars as Professor Schlesinger and President Baxter can misquote so many Communist sources, and indeed how such a careful writer as Mr. Krutch can fail to quote any source whatsoever for his account of the Marxist philosophy as a theory of robots. But, I fear, Aptheker's emotional and perorative *style* contrasts, in a self-righteous way, with his factual and rational

method. The light which scholarship can shed on public issues is dimmed when sarcasm darkens the facts or presumptions dilute the logic. This seems especially true of Marxism since so much of its analytic strength rests upon its critique of unconscious motivations and hidden interests. Aptheker's *method* is rarely dependent on either sarcasm or mere praise, and it seems to me that this is the best reason why he should have avoided the outraged tone of some of these essays.

A sympathetic observer might reply that he writes under considerable provocation. The times are hostile to his views, and men assert again and again that Communists are criminals and should be jailed. Whatever the reader may think of the merits of the Smith Act, it is clear that Dr. Aptheker must see his imprisoned friends as political prisoners, incarcerated for their views.

Actually Aptheker's style has both American and Communist precedent: there is the muckrakers' habit of passionate exposé and personal caricature; and when did Marx or Lenin write a college textbook or a scholar's treatise which was free from political encounter or partisan emotion? But precedent and provocation aside, there are faults in Aptheker's style. It distorts the material and it may alienate the reader. One example: Aptheker unfairly accuses Sidney Hook of placing Dreiser, Picasso, and Norman Bethune in a gang of conspirators. Yet behind the anger, he has written, in response to provocation, an essay of the utmost gravity, with evidence of Professor Hook's lack of objectivity and of abundant misquotation; but it is too hard to find our way through! Nor does Aptheker show that Professor Hook's views actually entail Professor Bridgman's anti-social and egocentric pessimism.

Despite all the difficulties of polemic, I urge the reader to be tenacious, even though he may well reject the sneers and the shouts. There is a man of high intelligence here and what he says derives from his anatomical skills of dissection, operating on the body of current political cliché. How damning are his contrasts of statement and fact! How many liberal Democrats know that their own eminent historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., believes that "all important problems are insoluble"? How many remember the unanimous error of the Western experts on the Soviet Union when they all—Americans, British, Nazis, Fascists alike—informed each other that Hitler would beat Russia in at most twelve weeks? How many know that the median annual income of American Negro families in 1949 was under \$1,600, at a time when the government's estimate of the minimum cost of decent living was \$3,450?

Aptheker works to relate ideals to factual origins, that is, to offer a concrete genetic analysis in place of an abstract idealistic analysis. Thus we read his account of the Open Door and of justice at Guam.

Genetic analysis is, at once, causal and historical. It requires a hypothesis concerning the relations among facts. Aptheker summarizes the Marxist theory of historical causation as social conflicts based on clashing economic interests, contrasting this with the views of other historians. He goes on, as in the essays on Hiss and McCarthy, to offer explanations of the functions, motivations, and political framework of specific happenings. Needless to say, he does not *prove* Marxist conceptions of social history in this book. What is important is that he offers the reader a conception which at least rests its claim on the adequacy it has in providing rational understanding. Aptheker notes that this is a criterion which such assorted viewpoints as those of nonsense (Oakeshott), incomprehensibility (Berdyayev), utter individuality (Fling), pure correlations (Brinton), and spiritual contemporaneity (Croce) seem to reject. With Aptheker, the reader can find grounds and reasons to reject or accept the author's views.

As Aptheker sees it, many critics of Marxism are beating a straw man of economic determinism. Ideas and ideals do matter in the Marxist view. The reader may find this to be the most positive point of the book. In contrast with the view of the Communist theory which so many critics present, Aptheker holds that Marxism is an activist theory. Men make their own history, said Marx, and while the theory of historical materialism explains the objective basis and source of men's ideas and ideals, it does not, in so doing, explain them *away*. Likewise, the popular conception of the Marxist robot-man is challenged by Aptheker's repeated reference to the French and Czech Communists who were lone martyrs, spiritual heroes in the face of Nazi power.

We need to ponder the curious amalgam of partisan fervor and academic research with which Aptheker writes, and which he clearly regards as a particular virtue of the Marxist philosophy. It rests upon the Marxist claim to be a union of theory and practice; what critics may regard as a weakness, the Communist sees as a strength, whether he deals with matters of historical investigation or with public events. Can we assent to this paradox, the partisan scholar? If we ourselves cannot avoid our own amalgamations, should we praise them? And, in a more personal reference, we note that the Communist's belief in Marxism is rationally the source of his membership in a Marxist party and of the policies of that party. But joining is more than a matter of Pure Reason; such a motivational mixture of passion and reason deserves closer examination, for the two are susceptible to much hostility. Should we not expect a Marxist account of the dialectic of moral attachment and rational detachment?

I cannot judge these essays as an expert in the social sciences,

but can only try to show the reader why I believe they are relevant to our lives as citizens. But is it advisable for one who is not trained as an expert on economic and social issues to express views on such matters? Albert Einstein answered this query with the conclusion that "we should be on guard not to overestimate science and scientific methods when it is a question of human problems . . . we should not assume that experts are the only ones who have a right to express themselves on questions affecting the organization of society" ("Why Socialism?" in *Monthly Review* May 1949). If we refrain from deciding social issues in as responsible manner as we can, others will decide them for us, perhaps not scientifically and perhaps in *their* interests. The question should be, can we afford not to consider the questions which Aptheker raises? Do we not owe it to ourselves to ascertain the proportion of truth, error, and half-truth in his analyses of social issues?

(4)

While I cannot agree with all that Dr. Aptheker says in these pages, I find myself even more at odds with him on problems that are implicit. Perhaps it will be helpful if I state briefly a number of objections and questions.

The frequent charge that the Marxist scheme is intellectually dogmatic seems to me to have two kernels of substance: the Marxist thinker sometimes substitutes a proposal for a proof, a program of theoretical explanation for the required explanation; on the other hand, the same thinker may brusquely dismiss a rival theory. Thus, Dr. Aptheker has certainly shown the *relevance* of economic considerations, even of class interests, in explaining political events; but he has said little to show the explanatory *dominance* and causal priority of such factors. Can he reject economic determinism, assert human responsibility, and yet summarily dispense with the possibility of other objective factors, themselves independent of the economic? Both his rejection of the first and his assertion of the second call for an analysis of supplementary causation. In more general terms, I think of the hasty treatment Communists have accorded the views of Einstein and Freud, of the philosopher Carnap, the physicist Bohr, and, at Dr. Aptheker's hands, the historian Croce.

Let us consider the last case. The original source of Marx's logic of change, and hence of the Marxist theory of history, is in the early nineteenth century idealist philosophy of Hegel. Although transformed and transcended, the idealist contribution to historical materialism is nevertheless of significance, for it is this which makes possible both the repudiation of mechanical determinism and that affirmation of activity which play so positive a part in Dr. Aptheker's

thinking. Benedetto Croce is an idealist who broke with Hegel, denying just that part of Hegel's thought which made a pattern of history predictable, retaining that part which could stimulate both the Fascist philosophy of pure irrational action and a liberal philosophy of pure rational liberty. To the greatest of Italian Communist thinkers, Antonio Gramsci, Croce's thought was the highest point of liberal Italian culture, and hence the starting point for a new and creative development of the Marxist philosophy. But of this Aptheker gives us no hint; on the contrary, he ignores what is challenging and alive in Croce while emphasizing what is negative and dead.

Dr. Aptheker treats Walter Lippmann with more understanding, but yet with a serious omission. Lippmann, as Aptheker shows, loses faith in democracy at the crucial point: recognizing certain facts of mass ignorance and mass illiberalism, he concludes that the masses are incapable, and leaps to a doctrine of a purified élite, an aristocracy. But democratic faith is in human potentiality, not actuality. If the electorate is informed, and if they participate in the social process of government, then their decision will be right. Obviously this raises a question of the means of education and the media of information. Jefferson decided that education was the keystone of the democratic structure; Marx wanted to know who will educate the educators. Mr. Lippmann evidently feels that the conflict today is between nations led by Communist élites and nations led by mass-corrupted, i.e. "democratic" capitalist élites. Now a solid faith in the people is implied in all that Dr. Aptheker writes. And yet his faith has room for a conception of leadership which Mr. Lippmann may recognize. Whereas Lippmann rejects the idea that people are wise and good, and goes on to his pure élite, Lenin and Aptheker reject the idea that people are *spontaneously* wise and good, and proceed to the need for a party. It is true that the "masses must have grasped what is at stake" (as Aptheker quotes Engels) in the Communist view of a democratic political movement, and it is true that the masses are spontaneously wicked in Lippmann's view; this is a significant distinction, a difference between optimism and pessimism regarding humanity, but can Dr. Aptheker dismiss Lippmann's problem of the élite, the educators, without further justification? The possibility of a democratic political machinery is at stake and, with it, scientific analysis of the social basis and mass psychology of reactionary and Fascist movements.

I should like to put this problem in a broader national context. There are many Americans who share with the Communists a belief in the advisability of some measure of central economic planning. The old cliché is that Communists seek economic democracy while

liberals seek political democracy, each claiming that the desire of the other will be achieved only by the prior attainment of his own goal. This needs a most careful formulation, particularly by the conscientious American Communist; for it is in this country and Britain that the apparatus and emotions of political freedoms have been most highly developed, our precious rights of personal expression, of political endeavor, of habeas corpus, of social action. In the words with which Professor Einstein closed his article on socialism: "How [under a socialist planned economy] can the rights of the individual be protected . . .?"

ROBERT S. COHEN

Ass't. Prof. of Physics and Philosophy
Wesleyan University

Middletown, Connecticut
August 7, 1955

Professor Robert S. Cohen is now (1962) Chairman
of the Department of Physics at Boston University

Author's Note

These essays represent my reflections on and reactions to the events and issues of the past eight years. They have appeared, as reproduced here, in *Masses & Mainstream*, *Political Affairs* and *Science & Society*; the date of original publication precedes each essay. Much of whatever merit they may possess is owing to the critical comments that several of the editors of these publications offered the writer. I am especially indebted to the creative suggestions and criticisms of my friend, Samuel Sillen; and in this writing, as always, the proddings and corrections offered by my wife have been most helpful. I have attempted to convey some idea of my obligations to V. J. Jerome, Editor of *Political Affairs*, by this volume's dedication.

Shortcomings, errors and other failings, whatever they may be, are the responsibility of the author alone.

HERBERT APTHEKER

August, 1955

History and Reality

THIS ESSAY CONSISTS OF TWO SECTIONS. THE FIRST ATTEMPTS to survey the leading bourgeois philosophies of history today; the second counterposes to these philosophies an exposition of the essential features of historical materialism. The essay is not concerned with the application of particular philosophies or theories to specific historical areas, and thus such figures as Frederick Jackson Turner and Vernon L. Parrington are outside its purpose.

To the Marxist, as Marcel Cachin has written, history being "the true science of society . . . is the science of sciences. . . ." Many scoff at this evaluation of history and deny the possibility, let alone the reality, of a science of society. To them history becomes, as certain English educators have remarked, nothing but "the curse of modern education" filled with "best forgotten facts for boys to be crammed with." It is, then, not surprising that history has been dismissed as merely "an interesting form of literature" deserving little time in college, and one which might well be omitted from the curriculum altogether. Clearly the fate here assigned to Clio is preferable to that which is worse than death and is urged by such individuals as the former corporation lawyer currently employing his talents as Governor of Michigan, i.e., its prostitution as "a powerful weapon in the war against subversive activities."

The belief that history is "incoherent and immoral," in the words of the tortured Henry Adams, permeates bourgeois historiography today as a part, and a very important part, of the current deliberately provoked phenomenon of the renunciation of reason and the glorification of mysticism.

1. HISTORY AND REALITY

Thus Jerome Frank, in a book subtitled *A Philosophy for Free Americans*, finds that those who laughed at Henry Ford when he declared that "history is bunk" were in error. "It would be better for us today," writes the distinguished Judge, "if we had heeded, rather than jeered at, Ford's skepticism." Historical works are, *and can be*, nothing but "amusing, imaginative accounts," much like Kipling's "Just-So" stories. With such a beginning the ending is pre-ordained. We need, concludes Frank, a new revelation, a new church, fitted for the uniquely American "democratic religious attitudes."*

It was not always so, of course. In the vigorous days of capitalism, handbooks on historical method, like that by Langlois and Seignobos, and scholars like Buckle, Spencer, Flint, Lamprecht, Freeman, Ranke, Bury, the young Carl Becker, insisted, at the very least, on the possibility of a science of history. Most of these, however, postulated an idealistic world, and even the exceptions like Buckle and Spencer were, in Marx's words, the creators of an "abstract materialism" assuming an absolute distinction between mind and matter, neglecting the *processes* of history, the reciprocal character of cause and effect, and above all the active role of the masses of mankind, not merely the elite, in the determining of history.

In our era an obsolete economy turns to the politics of barbarism and the culture of chaos. A leader among England's professional historians, Harold Temperley, declares near the end of his career that "the idea that history is a science has perished." Another, John Buchan, later Lord Tweedsmuir, asserts that he can picture the muse of history "most easily" as "a child staring at the kaleidoscope of the centuries, and laughing—yes, laughing—at an inconsequence that defies logic, and whimsicalities too fantastic for art."

In the United States Charles A. Beard announced his flight toward the abyss with a presidential address in 1933 before

* Jerome Frank, *Fate and Freedom* (Simon & Schuster, N. Y., 1945), pp. 3, 27, 220. Compare Jose Ortega y Gasset: "... science taken as a whole, is it not also a myth, the admirable myth of modern Europe?"; "Man stands in need of a new revelation"—*Toward a Philosophy of History* (Norton, N. Y., 1941), pp. 16, 223.

the American Historical Association entitled "Written History as an Act of Faith." He saw the historian as compelled to choose among three alternatives: history as senseless; history as some cyclical, non-evolutionary, mysterious drama, *a la* Spengler (or, one may add today, *a la* Toynbee); or "history as actuality" in the sense of Condorcet or Marx. As for himself, while pledging the retention of the techniques of science, he felt it necessary to "dispel the illusion" that there could be "a science of history embracing the fullness of history, or of any large phase, of past actuality." His paper was marked by repeated appeals to the authority of the neo-Hegelian idealist, Benedetto Croce, the deviser of one of the most consistent philosophies of the dying bourgeois world.

As such, Croce requires somewhat extended notice. An early polemicist against historical materialism, Croce developed his idealistic historiography as an alternative to Marxism and has pushed it to its nadir. His own "philosophy of the spirit" is the single over-all reality. With this he has been slaying the materialistic interpretation of history for over fifty years, because, according to himself, it denies "spiritual and moral values." From this materialism "society itself must be cured so that it may inhale a freer, fuller air, and attain a nobler humanity." So rang one of his innumerable battle-cries for liberty—this one dated Naples, 1933! And from the same citadel of freedom he produced in 1938 *History as the Story of Liberty*. His admirers across the waters, in hailing this work, felt called upon to pause over the mystery of Mussolini's state and press permitting the appearance of a "story of liberty." Professor J. Salwyn Schapiro could only decide that, "If and when Fascist Italy is brought before the bar of judgment of an allied peace conference, she can appeal for clemency on the ground that she had not entirely lost her liberal soul. Proof: Benedetto Croce was allowed to live and write this book in Italy."*

That, then, is the reason: a fragment of a "liberal soul" remained in fascist Italy! Could there be some less abstract

* *Journal of the History of Ideas* (Oct., 1941), II, p. 605.

reason? Could it be because the book urges "repudiating materialism" as the prime necessity of civilization? Could it be because, according to Croce, Communism leads inevitably to "the beaten track which every absolutism, every despotism, every tyranny has always entered upon" and because Marx has produced a system "without a breath of humanity or liberty" and was himself "nearer than one imagines to Prussianism and to its cult of brutal force"? Could it be because, to Croce, liberty "will always be formal and legal, and therewith spiritual and moral: material or economic liberty is a meaningless phrase"? Finally, could it be because in this work the twenty-year crucifixion of his own countrymen is nowhere mentioned by this eulogist of "spiritual and moral liberty"?*

With the spirit as the only reality (and with its origin inexplicable), with all history therefore *inside* each historian ("all history is contemporary history") and thus with no such thing as error and no criterion for truth, even "liberty" may serve—did serve—fascism.**

Having such a mentor it is not surprising to find Beard now at Croce's level in urging that the "terms 'cause' and 'causality' should never be used in written-history" and deciding that "any definition of a complicated aggregation of events, conditions and personalities in history-as-actuality, such as the French Revolution or the American Revolution, is an arbitrary delimitation in time and space—an isolation of the 'data' in the mind or the imagination, not outside the mind . . . and the assignment of cause or causes to anything that cannot be accurately defined and isolated in fact is at best a highly dubious intellectual operation."***

* Croce, possessor of vast landed wealth, headed a reactionary bloc, *Fascio dell'Ordine* back in 1914. He was a member of the Giolitti Cabinet that prepared the way for Mussolini, and his closest collaborator, Gentile, became a member of Mussolini's own government. In 1924 Croce actively supported the fascist dictator; thereafter he remained the tolerated leader of the Loyal Opposition.

** See the analysis of M. Mandelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge* (N. Y., 1938), pp. 39 ff.

*** See note signed by Beard and Alfred Vagts in *Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography* (Social Science Research Council, N. Y., 1948), p. 136-37; see Mandelbaum, *op. cit.*, chaps. 7 and 8; and his "Causal Analysis in History," in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (Jan., 1942), II, pp. 30-50.

Beard's three alternatives, chaos, mysticism, materialism, are indeed real and the necessity to choose becomes more urgent daily. The revolutionary quality of the last has long been recognized, for Marxists have always insisted that a consistent materialist view is possible only from a proletarian standpoint. It is this quality which led a rather naive lady to decry the asserted fact that today "we tend to look on an understanding of the political, social, and economic world in which we live as the primary aim of the social studies program." This approach is wrong, says the headmistress of an exclusive girls' school, because it tends to produce a belief in "the need for change. . . . A materialist interpretation of past and present problems presupposes a materialist solution," so that, concludes our writer, with gleaming ink, "The door is thus directly opened to the 'isms'" and no longer is there full reliance on "moral and spiritual principles [and] Divine authority."*

With such dangers and such alternatives one need not be surprised that a one-volume condensation of Toynbee's *A Study of History* comes upon the market at this moment and sells over one hundred thousand copies in a few months and is to reach another half million homes as a book club gift. Nor is it surprising that such a work is hailed enthusiastically by almost all reviewers as offering, in the words of the *New York Times*, a "Way of Salvation."

To Toynbee the movement of history comes from God-endowed "creative personalities" who lead, in one way or another, the inert and passive masses. While these elite remain dynamic, civilizations bloom; when success, however, makes them proud and arrogant, break-down sets in. Another marked characteristic of Toynbeean world history is the "Schism of the Soul" which has hitherto characterized it. This schism, this "archaism and futurism," (in our era represented by the bourgeoisie and the proletariat) in actuality represents one vast spiritual dilemma, for each is "intrin-

* Katherine Smedley, "Moral Forces in American History," in *Social Education* (1943), VII, pp. 293-94.

sically incapable of succeeding" in its own efforts at self-realization. Essentially, moreover, "The difference between them [i.e., archaism and futurism] is a superficial difference of direction," and neither will get where it wants to go, wherever that may be, "because both are attempts to perform the impossible acrobatic feat of escaping from the Present without rising above the spiritual plane of mundane life on Earth." (VI, pp. 118n., 132.)*

If this particular direction of the "Way" appears to be marked by something less than utmost clarity and precision, certain others do not so suffer. For if the struggle between archaism and futurism is really superficial in content, one may ask whether there are not some real and meaningful conflicts today?

Yes, we are told, there are; or, at least, there is one very real and meaningful conflict. Today we face a supreme contest between a Western Way of Life, essentially Christian, and an Eastern Way of Life, not only non-Christian, but, in large part, essentially Jewish.

Let the author speak for himself:

When Descartes and Voltaire and Rousseau and Marx and Machiavelli and Hobbes and Lenin and Mussolini and Hitler have all done their best or worst, in their diverse spheres, to dechristianize the various departments of our Western life, we may still suspect that their scouring and fumigating has been only partially effective. The Christian virus or elixir is in our Western blood—if, indeed, it is not just another name for that indispensable fluid. . . . (V, p. 190.)

Or, again:

The distinctively Jewish (or perhaps originally Zoroastrian) element in the traditional religious inspiration of Marxism is the apocalyptic vision of a violent revolution which is inevitable because it is the decree, and irresistible because it is the work of God himself. . . . Marx has taken the Goddess "Historical Necessity" in place of Yahweh for his omnipotent deity, and the internal proletariat of

* Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History* (6 vols., Oxford University press, N.Y., 1934-1939).

the modern Western World in place of Jewry . . . it is actually the pre-Rabbinical Maccabean Judaism that our philosopher impresario is presenting in modern Western costume. . . . (V, pp. 178-79.)

Once more, Marxism "is doomed to failure" precisely because it has rejected Christianity; and so obsessed is Toynbee with this insidious delusion that he descends, in this instance, to the crassest type of misquotation: "Marxians . . . actually declare that Christianity is one of the most formidable obstacles in the way of their own effort to apply Socialism in practice. 'Christianity,' they say, 'is the opiate of the people.'"* (V, pp. 585-86.)

In the midst of such concern for this Christianity, this virus, this elixir, this blood, this Absolute Idea, one wonders, whose Christianity—Francisco Franco's? John Brown's?

Though Mr. Toynbee fears with Spengler the coming of chaos, of some kind of destruction of Western or Christian Civilization—"our doom," as he calls it (IV, p. 122)—still, unlike Nazidom's favorite philosopher, he is not altogether pessimistic. He finds, for example, that "There is a significant touch of irony in the fact that he [Lenin] is constrained to arm Russia for her fight against the West with a borrowed Western weapon, and to take his indictment of the Western Civilization at second-hand from a Western critic: the German Jew Karl Marx." (III, p. 201.) Then, too, the society has managed to survive the First World War and the Bolshevik Revolution even with its borrowed principles. There is, moreover, the possibility that Stalin "may chiefly be remembered as a politician who slyly shepherded his silly sheep back out of the Marxian wilderness in the direction of the

* It may be well to quote at some length the passage from Marx in which occurs this much-cited but little understood "opium" remark. It appears in Marx's "Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law": "Religious misery is, on the one hand, the expression of actual misery, and, on the other, a protest against the actual misery. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the kindliness of a heartless world, the spirit of unspiritual conditions. It is the people's opium."

"The removal of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for its real happiness. The demand that it should give up illusions about its real conditions is the demand that it should give up the conditions which make illusion necessary."—The entire essay is published in *The Modern Quarterly* (London, 1947), II, pp. 245-47.

bourgeois fold." (VI, p. 111.) So, it may be concluded, that "inasmuch as it cannot be supposed that God's nature is less constant than Man's, we may and must pray that a reprieve [from "our doom"] . . . will not be refused if we ask for it again in a contrite spirit and with a broken heart." (VI, p. 320.)

This then is Toynbee's message, this is his Way, this is his "opiate." No wonder the Book-of-the-Month Club decided to distribute some 500,000 copies free-of-charge!*

The "dangers" of materialism are not generally put quite so bluntly as by the last authors we have been considering. More often the alarm is raised to the effect that with "materialism the historical process appears devoid of soul. Everything is stripped of soul, of inner and mysterious life." Thus, materialists are upbraided for their coarseness. They are asked: Do you not understand that "History is not an objective, empirical datum, it is a myth?" Do you not understand that "history . . . possesses an inner significance and mystery?" Materialists are told that they must understand this, for "To understand the relationship between God and man as a drama of freely-given love is to lay bare the sources of history." Still, upon replying, "it is not clear," the materialist is brought up sharply, for he is now told that it is all right that way, he need not be unduly concerned if he does not understand, for really, it cannot be understood: "this freedom of God's love which is absolutely irrational and inapprehensible to reason, offers a solution [!] of the tragedy of world history."**

* See also Toynbee's "Encounters Between Civilizations," in *Harper's Magazine* (April, 1947), vol. 194, pp. 289-93, being an abstract of lectures with which he favored the students of Bryn Mawr College. Here we learn again that the great present danger to the West arises from "the offshoot of Orthodox Christendom in Russia . . . a Christian heresy. . . . The Russians . . . are now shooting it back at us. This is the first shot in the anti-Western counter-offensive . . ." Note too Toynbee's one method of salvation for our era—transfiguration, i.e., "enrolling ourselves as citizens of the City of God, of which Christ crucified is king." Of the creative personality needed today we learn: "It is only in so far as he succeeds in finding, and showing, the way into an Other World, out of the range of this City of Destruction that the would-be saviour is able to accomplish his mission." (VI, p. 279.)

** Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History* (Scribners, N. Y., 1936).

In the United States an influential group approximating philosophically the position of Berdyaev and Toynbee is that of the self-styled "theological realists," including figures like Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Tillich and Sherwood Eddy. The latest presentation of this school's philosophy of history has come from Mr. Eddy.

The title "theological realists" is well-taken, for to these individuals reality is neither mechanical nor organic nor material, it is "superorganic." They conceive of history "as the joint work of God and man," with God "in control of all events, whatever be the measure of man's freedom or sin." God is "the center of history and this center determines the aim of history." And it is because "we have left God out of our materialistic civilization" that evils exist; evils are due to "the self-destructive character of human nature when independent [!] of God." Now, "we cannot demonstrate the existence of God"; indeed, "demonstration is impossible here" for this is "a God of mystery, who is often a problem to us, as man is to himself and is perhaps to God." Nevertheless, Mr. Eddy "is absolutely sure . . . that God is indeed working and working effectively and ceaselessly in history." He is not only certain of this but certain that God is Christ, for faiths like Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism do not reach the "deepest and highest" levels of Christianity.*

Sentences such as these may or may not constitute effective ecclesiastical disputation, but they have nothing in common with science—or history.

After immersing oneself in the thoroughly mystical writing of Toynbee, Berdyaev and Eddy it is somewhat refreshing, and relatively revealing to follow the late Gertrude Stein in her exposition of history:**

"Now history has really no relation to the human mind at all because history is the state of confusion between anybody doing anything and anything happening.

* Sherwood Eddy, *God In History* (N. Y., 1947, Association Press, for the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations).

** Gertrude Stein, *The Geographical History of America or The Relation of Human Nature to the Human Mind* (Random House, N. Y., 1936), p. 105.

"Confusion may have something to do with the human mind but has it.

"I would rather not know than know anything of the confusion between anyone doing anything and something happening.

"So says the historian."

That is true. Some do.

Repeatedly one hears this denunciation of historical materialism on a "holier than thou" level concocted of misapprehension or distortion, the most common form of the latter being an identification of Marxism with economic determinism—something the good bourgeois readily understands! It is "crude, immoral and unhistorical" (Nicholas Murray Butler); it denies that historical figures "were human beings" and turns them into "economic or social abstractions" (Herbert Heaton); it cannot explain why a man "should . . . sacrifice his life for an idea" (Fred M. Fling); it makes of humanity "merely ventriloquist dummies of inscrutable forces" (Jerome Frank); it represents "essentially the repudiation of real discussion and reason . . . and direct appeal to violence . . . [and] finally spells . . . complete social chaos" (Frank H. Knight). No wonder that, with such a philosophy—denounced more often than studied during the past one hundred years—Sidney Hook, in his recent *The Hero in History*, requires only five pages to arrive at a point where he wants "one final word" in order to "leave Engels dangling on this *reductio ad absurdum* of his position."***

How strangely have behaved these "ventriloquist dummies" to whom human beings are mere abstractions! How idiotic of them, in the face of their own preconceived inscrutable forces, to resist the Bismarckian club, the Kuomintang terror,

* Typical is this from Toynbee (*op. cit.*, V, p. 426): "The classic exposition of Economic Determinism is, of course, that philosophy—or religion—whose founder is Karl Marx. . . ." It is this, rather than Marxism, with which M. M. Bober's misnamed *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History* (Harvard University Press, 1927) does battle; and it is the basic error in Henri See's *Materialisme historique et interpretation economique de l'histoire* (Paris, 1927). And it is with this type of distortion that George Plekhanov's *The Materialist Conception of History* (International Publishers, 1940), written back in 1897, is most concerned.

** See the excellent critique of Hook's book by E. B. Hobshaw and Stanley Evans in *The Modern Quarterly* (London, 1947), II, pp. 185-88, 279-86.

the fascist inquisition! What weird conduct all this is for devotees of chaos, for these crude and immoral men and women incapable, as they are, of understanding why anyone—let alone they, themselves—should sacrifice life for an ideal

Still, for the bourgeoisie denunciation alone will not do; there must be enunciation too. What shall replace historical materialism? To this, two types of answers are offered. One is of a positive nature and attempts another interpretation; the other is of a negative type, and denies the necessity for, the propriety or possibility of, any rational interpretation—a type already anticipated, to a degree, by the comments of Croce, Buchan, the present Beard and others.

Some within the positive group are moved to assert the existence of an alleged distinction (made long ago by Aristotle and repeated by Schopenhauer) between natural science, supposedly dealing with regularities and repetitions, and history, allegedly dealing with the particular and the unique.

The idea that history is concerned only with the absolutely unique is clearly allied with the Crocean thesis that all history is contemporary history, or in the words of a disciple, Ortega y Gasset: "The past is I—by which I mean my life." This decision is necessitated by "the collapse of physical reason" which is to be replaced by "vital, historical reason." Indeed Croce himself insists that "The material of history is the singular in its singularity and contingency. . . ."

Professor Fling has probably developed this concept more systematically than any other historian. He insists repeatedly that the interest of the historian must be directed solely "toward the *uniqueness*, the *individuality* of past social life." As a result not only are historical laws ruled out, but so are generalizations, for "a generalization assumes repetition." With generalization goes causation. And, though Professor Fling does not say so, language itself goes by the wayside, for may an historian employ generic terms which assume a similarity, may he use comparative words which assume a

relationship, may he use descriptive words which assume a cumulation of experience if history is concerned only with the unique? In brief, is not the absolutely unique, by definition, indescribable, unknowable, inexplicable, and therefore not a subject for communication, let alone historical writing?*

Many, of course, like Berdyaev, in practice though not in form, deny the possibility of interpretation by providing one so clouded with abstractionisms that they, in fact, give up rational explanation. The classic examples of this school are the counterparts of Hegel in the field of history, namely Ranke and Lamprecht with their Idea of Spirit (reaching according to them its finest form in Prussia). The presence of this Idea cannot be accounted for and its character must be intuitively known; nevertheless, in some way the Idea serves as the unifying and dynamic force in world history. With such a philosophy of history dominant in western academic circles, it is no wonder that some fifty years ago a revolt should have occurred resulting in the repudiation of attempts at any systematic interpretation. Historians thus were transformed into something approaching monks cataloguing "pure facts," the selection of which was determined by their conditioning, and the presentation of which served as justification for that conditioning.

Where under such circumstances interpretation and synthesis were attempted at all the results were generally of three types: mechanical materialism tending to omit humanity; or an eclecticism in which was found any and all types of alleged causes usually accompanied by the denial of the possibility of assessing their relative importance; or some form of mysticism, of a denial of reason.

Thus, as examples of mechanical materialism may be mentioned the works of men like the late Edward P. Cheney, and the influential geographer and climatologist, Ellsworth Huntington. These tend toward the position, to quote

* F. M. Fling, *The Writing of History* (Yale University Press, 1920). See Mandelbaum in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (Jan., 1942), III, pp. 31-33.

Cheney, of denying any consequence to the "voluntary action . . . of individuals or groups of individuals, much less of chance," and so suffer from a fatal weakness.

That there is a relationship between natural environment and history, that is, the activities of human beings within that environment—a relationship somewhat analogous to that existing between the physical setting and staging of a play and the content and acting out of that play—is certainly true. Indeed, the fact is so obvious that this may account for its being frequently overlooked in the past, and individuals like Montesquieu, Henry T. Buckle, Ellen C. Semple and Huntington himself, have rendered important service in calling attention to this. But where one tends to make the natural environment a determining factor (not only in a relatively static, but also in a dynamic sense) in history to the practical exclusion of the human beings whose conduct constitutes that history, he is guilty of a fundamental error.

The eclectic approach is, in a formal sense, a compromise between mechanical materialism and mysticism. Fundamentally, it adheres to the impossibility of effectively generalizing historical phenomena, postulates an absolute separation between man's "will" and man himself in a real world, and denies that historical causes, if at all ascertainable, can be "graded according to the degree of their influence."* This theory of no theory recoils with horror from the danger, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., saw it in his *Age of Jackson*, of "being enslaved by a theory of the past, or by a theory of the future," but generally ends up with a liberalism whose aim, citing the same writer as a witness, is "to keep the capitalists from destroying" capitalism.

This hypothesis of multiple, equal, cumulative, and, in part, unknowable causes—in which, citing Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*, "everything is cause to everything else"—results, as does a materialism bereft of humanity, in the denial of the possibility of any effective resolution of

* R. L. Seayler in *Political Science Quarterly* (1941), LVI, p. 37. For a systematic presentation of this approach, see Lewis Einstein, *Historical Change* (Cambridge University Press, 1946).

human injustices and oppressions. It leads to the belief, as expressed for example by the aforementioned Mr. Schlesinger, that "most important problems [are] insoluble."

A variant of this approach derives from that philosophy of no philosophy called pragmatism. Its disciples boast that the historians' task is to produce not truth, but usefulness. When one equates the physician and the faith-healer in terms of "truth"—i.e., achievement—as did James, the search for a valid historical theory will surely appear nonsensical. One may, however, dismiss pragmatism, for our purposes, with the words Oliver Wendell Holmes penned to his British friend, Sir Frederick Pollock, apropos of the then new intellectual fad: "... I always think of a remark of Brooks Adams that the philosophers were hired by the comfortable class to prove that everything is all right."

Finally, there is the increasingly influential school of mysticists themselves whose fundamental area of agreement is a scrapping of the concept of causation.

To replace it some have adopted Harold Temperley's "conflux of coincidences" idea and others have adopted the somewhat similar concept, originally propounded in another connection by Karl Pearson, of correlations. Thus, Professor Brinton, in a volume specifically renouncing the causative thesis, attempts a study of the French, English, American and Russian Revolutions with the idea of finding correlations or similarities amongst them which might offer some clue to a comprehensive understanding of complex historical events. Yet the similarities or correlations considered implicitly assume causation. How else can one account for those which are selected for comment? Thus, the author points to the fact that each of the revolutionary epochs was preceded by the renunciation on the part of a considerable number of intellectuals of the dominant values of the ancient society. But why point to this? Why not consider such similarities or correspondence as, let us say, the fact—if it be a fact—that Cromwell, Washington, Robespierre and Lenin were bald?*

* Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution* (N. Y., 1938, Norton). Note this on page 248: "We certainly must avoid the stupid question whether such

This type of implicit assumption of significant similarities would appear to remove the "conflux of coincidences" or the theory of correspondences schools of history-writers from the concept of causation only verbally and actually to place them with the eclecticists.

Others, most notably Charles A. Beard and Alfred Vagts, have called, as we have seen, for the eradication of the words "cause" and "causality," and have decided that where a "complicated aggregation of events" is concerned the assignment of causation "is at best a highly dubious intellectual operation." Unlike Teggart and Brinton, however, neither Beard nor Vagts has offered a specific substitute. Judging from Mr. Beard's latest volume,* he certainly has not discovered an alternative. For though that volume does avoid the use of the word "cause," it does not appear that the essential elements of the theory of causation have been in fact abandoned. Rather, a verbal escape from the necessities and implications of such a theory seems to have been fashioned with notably deleterious effects on both style and content.

Without generalization, synthesis, causation, it is not possible to write history. Men may turn to logography or to antiquarianism and spend their days pursuing "Researches into the American Army Button in the Revolutionary War," or describing a sleeve-link or a cartridge-box badge of the same period, as some have done, and be amiable gentlemen, honest and resourceful searchers for facts, but they remain experts on buttons, sleeve-links and badges and not, while in that capacity, historians.

Or, one may turn to another of Mr. Beard's alternatives—to chaos. Here nothing is impossible and everything will find

symbols [revolutionary ideas] 'cause' any kind of social change. Here as almost everywhere in the social sciences the cart-and-horse formula of causation is useless and indeed misleading." But the same author's *The United States and Britain* (Harvard University Press, 1945) has much old-fashioned causation in it. Consult the excellent critique by R. B. Schlatter, in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (June, 1943), IV, pp. 349-67. See also Frederick J. Teggart's plea for "revision of inherited ideas concerning causation in history," in *ibid.* (Jan. 1942), III, pp. 3-11 and Morris R. Cohen's coxent reply, *idem.*, pp. 12-29.

* Charles A. Beard, *American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1922-1940: A Study in Responsibilities* (Yale University Press, 1946). See M. Mandelbaum's remarks on Beard in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (Jan., 1942), III, pp. 30-50.

a buyer. This is true whether it be Koestler's Yogi, Wylie's vipers, Orwell's pigs, Sartre's no exits, Wilhelm Reich's and Henry Miller's "orgastic impotence," or the pistol culture and blood science of Goebbels and Rankin.

Finally, one reaches absolute negation. There is, for example, a professor at Cambridge University, Mr. Michael Oakeshott, whose philosophy postulates not only no world but also no values. And all this appears in the name of analyzing the nature of history.

To this individual—as to Croce and Ortega y Gasset—"all history is contemporary history." To him—as to Beard and Vagts and increasing numbers—causation is a snare and a delusion. The idea of any kind of general causative process he rejects as too comprehensive. The idea of any specific causative process he rejects as too limited. The idea of grading causes he rejects as tending to abstract historical events and this "is a monstrous incursion of science into the world of history." The idea of a conflux of coincidences, or of correlation and correspondences he rejects as similarly abstracting certain events arbitrarily and as showing a kinship to the insidious theory of causation by that very act of abstracting.

What, then, remains? Of history, nothing. "History accounts for change by means of a full account of change. . . . The method of the historian is never to explain by means of generalization but always by means of greater and more detail"—but apparently without a criterion of selection; army buttons will do as well as army movements. One is reminded of Darwin's comment to those who insisted that geologists should not explain but only catalogue: ". . . at this rate a man might as well go into a gravel-pit and count the pebbles and describe the colors."

That such a concept of history should be held by one who feels that, "A philosophy of life is a meaningless abstraction" is proper, for if all history is contemporary history and admits of no synthesis, one may choose only between "the practical apprehension of the futility of living" or "philosophic disillusion." As for the Cambridge scholar he chooses the last,

for the first "carries with it melancholy and may lead to suicide." But suicide dignifies life too much, it is an act involving choice; better philosophic disillusion, for this "is itself a disengagement from life to which suicide could add nothing relevant." Thus, and at last, "Philosophy is not the enhancement of life, it is the denial of life."* Such is irrationalism's ultimate rationalization!

II

Against mechanical materialism, eclecticism, and mysticism in any and every form the Marxist wages an implacable struggle. He adopts with Terence the proposition that nothing human is alien to himself, he asserts the existence of matter and the reality of the world, he insists that circumstances make man and man makes circumstances, he uses, cherishes science and devotes his philosophy to the enhancement, the fulfillment of life. To him the world is not a haphazard, meaningless abstraction; no, it is an "integral whole, in which things, phenomena are organically connected with, dependent on, and determined by, each other."** And not only are they interdependent and interconnected, they are also simultaneously moving, changing, dying, growing, appearing and disappearing, struggling, and withal, progressing.

With such a philosophy, existing because of, and in order to serve, humanity, that discipline of thinking which concerns itself exclusively with man and with his processes of existence in the past—that is, history—is indeed in Cachin's words, "the science of sciences."

Such a science must begin with man in this world, and it must begin with those activities of man which make possible his existence, that is, his productive activities. The latter concept is not confined in any narrow, mechanical or vulgar sense to involve merely money-making; it does not hold the filling

* Michael Oakeshott, *Experience and Its Modes* (Cambridge University Press, 1933). See a critique of this work by G. C. Field, "Some Problems of the Philosophy of History," in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1938, pp. 64-65.

** Joseph Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* (International Publishers, New York).

of one's pocket-book to be the determining force in history (though, of course, the necessity of having something in one's pocket-book is not without influence!).

Within the concept, productive activities—the ways in which the means of life are obtained, the manner of bringing into being those things without which the existence and continuance of human society are impossible—are subsumed not only the natural environment and the instruments of production, but also the people themselves who, as people and as the bearers of an antecedent culture, are the indispensable agents of production as well as the consumers of all that is produced.

This, all this, is clearly what Marx and Engels intend to convey when they refer, as they sometimes do, to "economic conditions" instead of mode of production or productive activities. The fact shines forth from most of their writings, and we shall content ourselves by citing one quotation specifically pertinent:*

What we understand by the economic conditions which we regard as the determining basis of the history of society [wrote Engels in 1894] are the methods by which human beings in a given society produce their means of subsistence and exchange the products among themselves (in so far as division of labour exists). Thus the *entire technique* of production and transport is here included. . . . Under economic conditions are further included the geographical basis on which they operate and those remnants of earlier stages of economic development which have actually been transmitted and survive. . . . Men make their history themselves, only in given surroundings which condition it and on the basis of actual relations already existing, among which the economic relations, however much they may be influenced by the other political and ideological ones, are still ultimately the decisive ones, forming the red thread which runs through them and alone leads to understanding.

And that even when so defined economic conditions may be unduly stressed—that is, stressed to the exclusion of the

* Engels to Starkenburg, Jan. 25, 1894 in Marx-Engels, *Correspondence*, 1854-1895 (International Publishers, N. Y., n.d.), pp. 516-17. Italics in original.

reacting superstructure—particularly as a natural response to their previous minimization, is clear, and has been forcefully stated by Marxists from the days of Marx and Engels through those of Plekhanov, Lenin and Stalin. One example of this, too, may suffice: "Marx and I," wrote Engels in 1890, "are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger writers sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasize this main principle in opposition to our adversaries, who denied it, and we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to allow the other elements involved in the interaction to come into their rights."*

Marxists hold, then, that it is the productive activities, and the experiences of the human beings responsible for those activities, that form the body of history, that constitute a history of peoples. They hold, also, that the societal relationships of those human beings, particularly in terms of their condition relative to productive forces—that is, their class position—play a key role in the acting out of the drama of history.

Because of the fundamental significance of the means of production, both natural and artificial, in terms of existence and in terms of the relative kinds of existence endured or enjoyed by the people, the Marxist seeks to understand the modes of ownership and control of these means. He sees within these varying modes—primitive, slave, feudal, capitalist—certain patterns of class relationships, certain relationships in the possession and utilization of property, which differ within each mode and which give rise to conflicts therein. And he sees the resolution of those particular conflicts arising as a result of the smashing of the productive restrictions inherent in each of those modes. And he believes that the present conflict differs decisively, qualitatively, from all others because its resolution, postulating the common ownership of the instruments of production, makes possible the elimination of class conflicts by expropriating the exploiters,

* Engels to Schmidt, Aug. 8, 1890, in *ibid.*, p. 477. Compare all this with the type of distortions to which attention has already been called.

by bringing into being a society consisting entirely of producers. This is why, to Marxists, the triumph of the workers will inaugurate the *human* epoch of history, the epoch free from man's exploitation of man, the epoch making possible the full, uninhibited and unimpeded development of mankind.

And while the Marxist holds this result to be certain, he does so because of his reading of human history. That is, he feels it will certainly come because he is certain of man's response to the developing contradictions produced by a senile social order. *The certainty, therefore, is not independent of humanity, the result does not come in spite of people; no, the certainty depends upon them, the result will be achieved, can be achieved, must be achieved, only by them.* That is, in a word, Marxism differs decisively from mechanical materialism both as applied to the past and as applied to the present and the future.*

Observe, then, the ludicrousness—or viciousness—of those who charge Marxism with being sordid and having no room for ideas and ideals, with creating a man all of stomach. Nonsense. Marx and Engels dealt in ideas. To charge them with ignoring or deprecating ideas is analagous to charging an electrician with ignoring or deprecating electricity. It was Marx who said that when an idea seizes the masses they transform it into a mighty material force.

Ideas, customs, mores, taboos, faiths, prejudices, *once they exist*, exert influence, frequently profound influence, at times an influence so great as to override certain immediate and material considerations. But they are derivative, they are secondary. They spring ultimately from material relationships, interests and forces. They are, therefore, explicable, and they respond in any decisive sense, to similar relationships, interests and forces.

When one knows that but a century ago the majority of

* On this question of inevitability see particularly: G. Plekhanov, *The Role of the Individual in History* (International Publishers, N. Y., 1940), pp. 11, 12; and John Somerville, *Methodology in Social Science: A Critique of Marx and Engels* (N. Y., 1938), p. 66; and his *Soviet Philosophy: A Study of Theory and Practice* (Philosophical Library, N. Y., 1946), p. 93.

white inhabitants of the United States of America approved of the enslavement of other human beings, while today practically none does so nakedly, he cannot believe that this was because those people were all mentally retarded or morally perverted. No, it is because slavery was and had been for some two hundred years the normal mode of production over a vast area in America, as a result of which enormous vested interests and certain tenacious patterns of conduct and ways of life had associated themselves with this institution. That one hundred years ago it was condemned at all is due first of all to the activities of the Negroes themselves, the prime victims of that mode of production; to the necessities of that system to grow or smother, a necessity precipitating struggle; and to the development of a contrary system of production within the same nation, at a differing rate and with different—in large part, contradictory—economic, political and ideological needs.

Those, then, who honestly confuse Marxism with some type of mechanical materialism or vulgar economism and assert that to a Marxist ideas and ideals have no reality and no influence would appear to be confusing origin with significance. Upon this particular facet of the question the words of Stalin are especially apt: * "We have been speaking so far of the *origin* of social ideas, theories, views and political institutions, of *the way they arise*, of the fact that the spiritual life of society is a reflection of the conditions of its material life. As regards their *role* in history, historical materialism, far from denying them, stresses their role and importance of these factors in the life of society, in its history."

And just as historical materialism affirms the role of ideas so it points to the existence of so-called "accidents" and the contributions of personalities, of individuals, to history. Thus, Marx declared, in 1871, that history would be "of a very mystical nature, if 'accidents' played no part . . . accelera-

* Joseph Stalin, *op. cit.*

tion and delay are very dependent upon such 'accidents.' *** And no one who reads the historical writings of Marx and Engels themselves can fail to see that they are very far from ignoring the influence of individuals upon the course of events. Their writings are filled with evidences of this, with concern over the effects of "personal animosities, fears and hopes, prejudices and illusions, sympathies and antipathies, convictions, faith and principles" upon the course of events. **

But in dealing with such phenomena the conviction is present that as to "accidents," frequently a prolonged and detailed examination of the particular incident involved will materially lessen the significance hitherto attributed to "accident." Moreover the event itself and the direction of its impact are ensconced within the body of surrounding forces and relationships which limit and help determine the results.

Much the same considerations apply to the role of individuals. They, too, even the greatest among them, reflect the society and the circumstances which produced and sustained them and it is neither possible for them to propose nor is it possible for their society to accept that which is without relevance, without continuity, without meaning for their era and area. It is here that the scientific problem lies today—given our present limits to knowledge—to discover as fully and as completely as possible the processes explaining the production of a Lincoln or a Lenin and their influence—that is, the degree of their acceptance by society. Biology offers a pertinent analogy: that science has not yet fathomed the causes of mutations and variations. It has not, however, abandoned its quest, and meanwhile labors to explain the survival within nature of particular variations.

Even should, however, the utmost clarity be attained in the spheres indicated concerning individuals and accidents this would not mean that all problems had been solved and that

* Marx to Kugelmann, April 17, 1871, in *Correspondence*, p. 310.

** The quotation is from Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Kerr, Chicago, 1904), p. 24, having reference to the differences between the Legitimists and the Orleanists.

the complete and perfect truth might be laid bare subject to no additions, corrections, amendments and qualifications. Ignorance may very well remain not only as to questions which have already been posited, but also as to questions which have not presented themselves to man's brain as yet. This has been true in the past and there is every likelihood that it is true today.

Historical materialism, then, does not claim to be a cure-all for ignorance. It is not some magic wand to be waved only by the initiated who then find all scales lifted from their eyes. It is not some simple expedient miraculously resolving knotty problems, much less some shibboleth the invoking of which spontaneously produces desired "facts" in meaningful sequences.

How Marx and Engels scorned the simplicists!—those who "simply make use of the phrase historical materialism (and *everything* can be turned into a phrase), in order to get their own relatively scanty historical knowledge . . . fitted together into a neat system as quickly as possible. . . ." * Marx, who well knew the meaning of research, excoriated the "simpletons" who felt the answers were ready at hand and "whose inspiration comes 'from above.'" Exhausting and excruciating search was not for them: "Why should the innocents bother their heads about economics and history?" To them, "everything is so simple." Yes, "everything is so simple!" Marx exploded. "In their heads perhaps, the simpletons." ***

But the fact of ignorance does not justify cynicism and escapism. Rather, may not an awareness of ignorance be the beginning of all wisdom, the beginning of science, the beginning of a disciplined logical pursuit of reality?

Charles A. Beard is grievously in error when he asserts that a science of history is impossible and inconceivable because, among other things, given its existence, "it would be omniscience. It would reveal mankind enclosed in the iron

* Engels to Schmidt, Aug. 6, 1890, in *Correspondence*, v. 473.

** F. Mehring, *Karl Marx* (Covici, Friede, N. Y., 1935), p. 238.

framework of its own celestial destiny" and with all past, present, and future known "humanity would merely await its doom."*

This identification of science with certainty is Mr. Beard's act; it is not that of scientists. Rather they prefer to avoid "finality in statement" as being "out of place in science, especially today, when change and doubt are the very spirit of scientific thought, when the immutable elements are known to be mutable, when constancy in size and weight is no longer a necessary quality of the molecule and when the laws of thermo-dynamics are being questioned."**

We presume Mr. Beard would admit that celestial mechanics is not the only science. Moreover, the predictive capabilities of sciences vary with their nature. Thus, for example, neither geology nor paleontology is very much given to prediction into the future, but both are sciences—or, are they too to be dismissed by some such formula as: "All geology is contemporary geology"? And in terms of uncertainty one has not only the remaining riddles of biology and physiology, but disciplines such as meteorology, psychology and medicine, still largely characterized by their uncertainties, but without sciences.

Langlois and Seignobos were correct when they wrote fifty years ago that, "History, which is more encumbered with details than any other science, has the choice between two alternatives: to be complete and unknowable, or to be knowable and incomplete. All the other sciences have chosen the second alternative." That history *must* always be incomplete is true, for so much has perished without a record, and none of it may be recreated again. But the world and man do exist and have existed, the past has reality and much of it is knowable and is subject to examination and presentation. The task of the historian is to discover which scheme of approach to this reality is most fruitful and most illuminating. That frame of reference which holds in place coherently and meaning-

* G. A. Beard, *The Discussion of Human Affairs* (Macmillan, N. Y., 1936), p. 87.

** William Seifriz, *Protoplasm* (McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1936), p. viii.

fully the total mass of the ascertainable past, or more of it than any other, is the instrument with which a science of history comes into being and may be developed and further perfected.

Marxists believe that historical materialism is this frame of reference, this tool, this guide. Let that be the question. It is on that level that the debate belongs; anything less than this dissolves into senseless chatter, cowardly escapism, or despicable cynicism.

What follows from all this for those who have examined and have chosen? What are the obligations of the Marxist historian, particularly so far as the United States is concerned?

Engels provided the answer in six words: "All history must be studied afresh. . . ."

Are the responsibilities imposed by this truth clearly perceived? Do we mean what we say when we speak of the inseparability of the past, present and future? Do we mean what we say when we speak of the dignity, maturity, wisdom bestowed upon a people and a class who are in possession of their heritage, who understand from whence they derived in order to know where they are going and in order to get there? How shall the victim of amnesia fend for himself—and in a hostile world! Is this not a task worthy of the best amongst us and in us, and does it not require prodigious labors and numerous laborers? Something approaching a beginning has been made, but so much remains to be done. Now is the time and now is the need.

American history to date, almost in toto, is the work of non-Marxists and so we arrive at the necessity of re-writing it. But *we* must re-write it, at first hand. We must search out new meanings from established facts and from newly-uncovered facts. Our eyes must search for *sources*, and we must search out meanings from those sources.

The task, then, is not one of "interpreting" the standard

* Engels to Schmidt, Aug. 5, 1890, in *Correspondence*, p. 473.

American historians, of "making allowances," or shifting emphases. The task is one of mastering their works, and of supplanting them. This process can begin only when Marxist eyes go into their sources, and uncover and use sources never touched by them because of distaste, disinterest or ignorance.

It would be well to examine at this point the problems of historical objectivity so incessantly raised by these historians. The question is a two-fold one. It involves in the first place the argument between those who differ as to whether or not an historian can be free of assumptions, prejudices, a certain set of beliefs largely guiding both his selection of data and his use of them. It involves in the second place the very much more profound question as to whether truth as such, good as such, exist or not.

As to the first question, the argument against so-called impartiality has been stated and restated innumerable times, and is overwhelming, but the conclusion generally drawn therefrom—the impossibility of an historical science—does not at all follow. Certainly Harry Elmer Barnes is correct when he declares "that no truly excellent piece of intellectual work can be executed without real interest and firm convictions," and that "the notion that the human intellect can function in any vital form in an emotionless and aimless void" is absurd.

Clearly, the challenge offered by men like Beard and Allan Nevins to be shown one "non-partisan" historical work, one work free of a subjective quality, in the sense in which this term is used by them, has not been and apparently cannot be successfully met. The very fact that man is the historian—or the natural scientist for that matter—guarantees the presence of his personality, his viewpoint, his interpretation, his selection—in a word, his work.

It is, then, unquestionably true—indeed, self-evident—as men like Turner and Beard have written, that to quote the latter, "any written history inevitably reflects the thought of the author in his time and cultural setting." When one says this he demonstrates the inseparability of the past and the

present, *but he does not refute the reality of the past or the present.* Carl Becker, anticipating Beard, exclaimed, "O History, how many truths have been committed in thy name!" and insisted that the past was a "screen upon which each generation projects its vision of the future." And Harold Temperley felt that when one showed the impossibility of an impartial history he had simultaneously banished the possibility of a science of history. He accepted this "resolution" of what appeared to him to be a dilemma with vigor and insisted that, therefore, the notion of objectivity was not even "desirable."*

And in the midst of assertions that "complete objectivity would be as undesirable as it would be impossible," one has appeals for "non-partisan history," by which is meant history with neither "Whig [n]or Tory spectacles."** In practice this materializes either in such writings as Oberholtzer's notorious "non-partisan" accounts of labor struggles; or, in some more subtly worded weighing of "both sides of the question," with judgment—and history—suspended in ostentatious indecision, resulting in works that, like pendulums, are *full of movement and yet motionless.*

Unless one lifts himself above this intensely partisan "non-partisanship," unless one sees that though there have been "many truths," there yet may be truth, unless one disengages himself from an ethic premised upon man's exploitation of man, this question of subjectivity is indeed insoluble and one can either ignore it or accept it, but he cannot overcome it.

John Somerville has put this point extremely well:***

* According to Louis Gottschalk, because "good historical method requires that one gather with regard to any subject which one is studying, all the available data," the historian has a choice "between knowing more and more about less and less, or less and less about more and more." This, plus the allegedly ineradicable subjectivity of history, led Professor Gottschalk to declare that "history, in my opinion, cannot be scientific."—"The Scope and Subject Matter of History," in *University of Kansas City Review* (Winter, 1941), VIII, p. 79. But in all science, "a minute division of problems has been found the usual predecessor of complete solution; the small, the seemingly unimportant, the usually neglected must be considered in arriving at a well-rounded, whole idea. Thus science advances by dividing and conquering."—Morris Goran, "The Literary Revolt Against Science," in *Philosophy of Science* (July, 1940), VII, p. 382.

** Charles M. Andrews, in *American Historical Review* (Jan. 1925), XXX, pp. 243, 244.

*** Somerville, *Soviet Philosophy*, p. 91.

The historical materialist believes in absolute right in the same way as he believes in absolute truth, as an objectively existing state of affairs to which our accumulating knowledge and practice become a fuller and fuller approximation, relative because there is something for them to be relative to. Belief in an absolute right [or truth, one may add] is evidently not the same thing as a belief that our knowledge of it is absolutely correct.

This, too, is an essential thesis of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, this concept of truth as absolute and knowledge as relative, this conviction that there is an objective yet dynamic reality to which knowledge, as it becomes more and more complete, more and more closely approaches.

Aligning oneself with the rising class, the class whose victory, at any given epoch, results in enhancing the productive capacities of mankind and thus in making possible the enrichment of life for more and more people, resolves not only the problem of what is good, it resolves the related one of what is true.* Only by this complete renunciation of the accepted values and premises of the bourgeoisie may one resolve that class's problem of an infinitely regressive relativism, may one break the bonds of its subjectivity and create, in this sense, an objective history. Only by the fullest and most complete devotion to one's nation may one achieve internationalism; only by the fullest and most complete understanding of necessity does one arrive at freedom; and only by the fullest and most complete identification with humanity may one achieve objectivity.

Such a philosophy carries for its upholders the obligation indicated in Allen Johnson's remark that "the more daring and more promising the hypothesis the greater the obligation to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." In our world the most daring and most promising hypothesis is dialectical and historical materialism.

* For a Marxist approach to morality and "the good" see Howard Selsam, *Socialism and Ethics* (International Publishers, N. Y., 1943). As to those who raise the question, how does one know that such things as health, security and education are "good"?—one need not reply, for such individuals, and they are increasing in our society, require therapeutic treatment, not argumentation.

From those who use it, or attempt to use it, then, one must expect the most rigid adherence to the canons of science, the most uncompromising and relentless search for data and their meanings. This is preeminently a philosophy for life, and those who use it are affecting life. Thus it was that "Marx thought his best things were still not good enough for the workers . . . regarded it as a crime to offer the workers anything less than the very best!"*

The Marxist conception of history is, as Engels declared, "above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelians."** It is a powerful searchlight, so powerful that if improperly handled it may blind rather than illuminate. And it must be *used*, it must accompany the searcher, who, light in hand, diligently works at unearthing the truth.

From great responsibilities flow great opportunities. Faced with the challenge of mastering the past, comprehending the present and thus assisting in forging the future, what greater opportunity for service exists?

Ascending social classes are wedded to science. That the decadent ones now grasp at every repudiation of reason and make of intellectual despair a lucrative virtue is indicative of their impending doom. Does not the scripture tell us that the devil rages, "for he knoweth he hath but a short time"?

* Engels to Schmidt, Aug. 5, 1890, in *Correspondence*, p. 473.

** One must, of course, guard against anachronism, or distortions occasioned by hindsight, "so that later history is made the goal of earlier history, e.g., the goal ascribed to the discovery of America is to further the eruption of the French Revolution."—Marx-Engels, *The German Ideology* (International Publishers, N. Y., 1939), p. 28.

2. POLEMICS ON THE "NEW CONSERVATISM"

Walter Lippmann and Democracy

BACK IN 1933, THE EDITORS OF "THE NATION," IN INTRODUCING a series of four articles devoted to Walter Lippmann remarked that he was "probably the most influential [American] journalist of our time." A similar estimate is true for our own day both in terms of the extensive audience reached by his columns (they appear in about 140 U.S. newspapers; 17 Latin-American, 9 Canadian, and in Australian, Greek, Japanese and other papers throughout the world) and in terms of the special seriousness with which so much of his audience studies his opinions.

This year there has appeared Mr. Lippmann's twentieth book, *Essays in The Public Philosophy*,* which for weeks has been among the nation's best-sellers, and reached additional thousands through nearly complete re-publication in a single issue of the reactionary organ, *United States News & World Report*, and in several issues of the liberal *Atlantic Monthly*. This offers a good occasion for a critical evaluation of the work of Mr. Lippmann.

In the extensive literature about Walter Lippmann a recurrent theme is his alleged ambiguity. One repeatedly finds such questions as those posed a generation ago by Amos Pinchot: "Has he the liberal and democratic view, or . . . is he the prophet . . . of big-business fascism?" The simultaneous publication of extracts from his latest book in the *Atlantic* on the one hand and *U. S. News* on the other,

* Little, Brown.

indicates the same quality, as do the book's reviews by two writers in the *New Republic* who find opposite lessons.

The same duality appears in Max Freedman's review of *The Public Philosophy* in *The Nation*. He begins by saying: "Few things would be easier than to caricature this hook and make out that Walter Lippmann is an enemy of the democratic tradition." Easier or not, Mr. Freedman feels it best "to take Mr. Lippmann at his own evaluation" and for this he quotes Lippmann as saying, early in the volume: "I am a liberal democrat. . . ." Yet, before Mr. Freedman is half through with his own review, he is discussing Lippmann's "condemnation of the democratic process"—peculiar conduct for a liberal democrat who is a friend of the democratic tradition.

Related to this apparent duality is another striking feature of the literature concerning Lippmann. Since the day, over thirty years ago, that Mr. Lippmann left the then very young *New Republic* to join the editorial staff of the *New York World* to the day of the appearance of his latest volume, writers have commented upon what they described as Lippmann's change in what *had been* liberal or even radical views. Mr. Lippmann is forever the "former liberal."

A generation ago, his *New Republic* colleague, Herbert Croly, reported a Lippmann shift and attributed it to "unpardonable opportunism"; and just the other day, R. H. S. Crossman headed his piece on *The Public Philosophy*, "Mr. Lippmann Loses Faith." In this case the Lippmann shift was attributed to the "snapping of his patience" after years of "throwing the pearls of his expertise before the swine of a vast syndicated readership" (*New Statesman & Nation*, June 11, 1955). Others, including Carl Friedrich, Heinz Eulau and Max Lerner, have offered varying explanations for what they have viewed at different times as sharp changes in Lippmann's position.

Lippmann's biographer devotes a rather sharp sentence to this problem: "The subtle [?] influences of a lifetime of middle-class comfort and a growing ambition to achieve

wealth and fame helped to refashion Lippmann's convictions."*

We shall not enter into the game of guessing Mr. Lippmann's motivations because we do not know him or them; because we are interested in his ideas, not his psyche; and because, therefore, his personal motivations are irrelevant to our inquiry.

We have, however, indicated the prevalence and range of the guessing to show the nearly unanimous assumption that notable inconsistency has marked Mr. Lippmann's career. This, we think, is wrong. Mr. Lippmann, with the exception of his extreme youth, has always been anti-democratic; his latest book confirms and sharpens his anti-democratic outlook.** This is said despite Lippmann's insistence in the book that he is "a liberal democrat" and despite Mr. Freedman's warning that such a characterization as I have offered is actually a caricature of the man's views. It is not a caricature. Mr. Lippmann is, and has been for at least thirty years, a systematic opponent of democracy because he has been a principled proponent of monopoly capitalism.

It is true, of course, that Lippmann's banner has fluttered with the breeze—and nearly bowed to an occasional storm—but the heart of the matter is that even his semantically most liberal works contain an anti-democratic essence. For the past generation and more this essence has been scantily disguised; with *The Public Philosophy*, issued in the midst of a "New Conservatism" upsurge, the essence is distilled and boldly presented.

There are, however, certain attributes special to Mr. Lippmann which explain his mountain-top position. These account for so astute an observer as Henry Steele Commager declaring Lippmann to be "the most sagacious of American publicists" (*The American Mind*, Yale Univ. Press, 1950, p. 221).

Style is not unimportant, and Mr. Lippmann's literary

* David E. Weingast, *Walter Lippmann* (Rutgers Univ. Press, 1949), p. 13

** This point is made in the discerning review of *The Public Philosophy* by Prof. H. H. Wilson, in *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, June 27, 1955.

craftsmanship is great. Essentially it adds up to a tone of authoritative consideration, so that even his remarks which in content may be extremely tentative in impact seem to close debate. Lippmann's learning is formidable (though his scholarship is careless) and the nature of his experiences are extraordinary (before he was thirty, to go no further, Mr. Lippmann had been secretary for the Socialist mayor of Schenectady, assistant to Lincoln Steffens, an editor of *The New Republic*, and confidant of President Wilson).

Perhaps of greatest consequence are the concentration and sobriety that Mr. Lippmann has brought to his work. Apparently his powers of self-discipline are unusual and he has bent these single-mindedly for several decades to the study and elucidation of central political and social questions confronting the American ruling class. Early in his career Lippmann commented that "the price of respectability is a muffled soul bent on the trivial and the mediocre." He must answer for the condition of his own soul, but the fact is that he has concentrated on the vital and the significant, and this gives to his indubitable respectability a special consequence. Always his point of departure has been that of the American ruling class, and his origins, contacts, friendships have been almost entirely limited to that class, or to comparable elements abroad.

The basic features of our historical epoch—the moribund nature of imperialism and the inevitability of its replacement by Socialism—have been apprehended, partially and in distorted form, by Walter Lippmann. It is the impact of this process of decay and the challenge of this process of growth which his writings mirror, and since his viewpoint is that of the doomed, his prose is filled with foreboding. Thus, in 1914, in his second book (*Drift and Mastery*): "We have lost authority . . . We drift . . . All weakness comes to the surface. We are homeless in a jungle of machines and untamed powers that haunt and lure the imagination." In 1939: "The Amer-

ican people have no vision of their own future . . . they are seized by deep uncertainty . . . [are] making themselves sick with nervous indecision" (*Life Magazine*, June 5). Today, in his latest book, referring to "Western society": "What we have seen is not only decay—though much of the old structure was dissolving—but something which can be called an historic catastrophe."

Something of the problem that has been harassing Lippmann was posed in the early days of American imperialism by the leader of that "New Freedom" which was to appear attractive to the young Lippmann. Woodrow Wilson, speaking before the Virginia Bar Association in 1897 on the subject, "Leaderless Government," said: "This is not a day of revolution; but it is a day of change, and of such change as may breed revolution, should we fail to guide and moderate it."

To the effort at guiding and moderating—and thwarting—Lippmann has devoted his life. The result is not heartening—the powers of 1914 are still untamed and now greatly enhanced; the deep uncertainty of 1939 is deeper, the nervous indecision is greater; the past fifty years sum themselves up for Lippmann as an historic catastrophe.

Tracing the remarkable intellectual career of Lippmann will afford a panoramic view of the path of the best thought of which U.S. imperialism has been capable, and will help explain the nature of its present position.

Lippmann begins, as quite a few do at the same period, by thinking of himself as a Socialist, and is, indeed, president of the Harvard Socialist Club. His first published article, in the *Harvard Illustrated Magazine*, for 1909, held Socialism to be "the coming thing," deplored the ignorance of so many students concerning "this supremely important subject," and urged its inclusion in college curricula.

Until 1912 he holds to this allegiance and his few writings of the period identify him with the Left-wing of the Socialist movement. Indeed, he resigned his post, on May Day, 1912,

as secretary for the Socialist Mayor of Schenectady because he said the Mayor was more reformist than Socialist. In April, 1912, he had anticipated this action by declaring in *The Masses* that a bold Socialist program was needed and that it was necessary to keep Socialism distinct from reformism, otherwise "the movement would be impregnated with half-baked people who don't understand Socialism." In *The Call* of June 1, 1912, he returned to the theme of the need to make of the Socialist Party not a reformist organization, but "a party of genuine radicals."

With that, however, Lippmann's fling was over. Despite these early espousals of radicalism Lippmann seems to have spoken truly when he told his biographer, in 1949, that he was "never a Marxist" and that "he had never accepted the idea of the class struggle."

Certainly, from 1913 on, Lippmann has conducted a vigorous and lucrative* campaign to vindicate his youthful change of mind and heart. All of his political activities and intellectual endeavors since then have been directed towards preserving monopoly capitalism by bringing to the rich responsible thinking geared to their interests, by urging upon them a "reasonable" approach, and by attacking democratic concepts and practices.

It is not often that one can catch some Lippmann prose that is not leather-bound and vacuum-packed. This makes the exceptions all the more valuable. An outstanding exception is the speech he delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association of National Advertisers, held in November, 1945, and published by the Association in pamphlet form "for circulation among business executives." Speaking on "The Need for Enlightened Business Leadership" to fellow professional servitors, Mr. Lippmann was strikingly direct and simple.

The "need," he said, was acute because the challenge was grave. The businessmen's future, he warned, "is certain to

* His biographer writes: "He is believed by friends to be a thrifty person who has made good investments. *Time* on one occasion [Sept. 27, 1937] said that his yearly income was \$54,329. Others have placed the figure very much higher."

be dark, turbulent, and tragic if they are not strongly led by men who take seriously, and take regularly, honest and wise advice on the world they are living in, the character of the age to which they belong. . . ." He went on to remind his listeners

that whereas 50 years ago, even 25 years ago, the system which we call free enterprise was universal among all economically developed countries, today the United States is the only big industrial country now committed to the perpetuation of free enterprise.

Lippmann kept hammering away at the need for "an enlightened public policy"; he insisted that nothing could be "settled by saying the hell with the New Deal, the hell with labor unions, the hell with the Russians." Of course, was the clear implication, we would all like to see these monsters consigned to hell, but wishing for it would not accomplish it; they were not goblins to be dissolved by imprecations, but were real forces requiring "enlightened public policy."

If businessmen ignore the enlightenment they will be "acting exactly like all other governing classes who throughout history were on their way down and on their way out." They must not follow the model of the French aristocrats who "clung so grimly and stupidly to their privileges that they lost their power"; no, the model is the British rulers who change form with splendid elasticity and retain substance with notable tenacity. Lippmann said there was "nothing so pertinent to the peculiar position of American businessmen in the years that lie ahead" as this French-British contrast. With that came the noble exhortation that no doubt quickened the sensitive hearts of the assembled advertising executives: "Let the captains of industry be captains indeed, and go forward unafraid into the days to come."

It is not unfair to suggest that when Lippmann told these advertising tycoons of the businessmen's critical need of "honest and wise advice", he and his audience assumed that the man addressing them was a shining example of such a counsellor.

This advice has had perhaps half a dozen central threads that weave in and out of Lippmann's work, to reappear as a finished pattern in his most recent volume. These main themes will now receive our attention.

Lippmann has always insisted on the overwhelming importance—from the imperialists' viewpoint—of crushing Socialism. A considerable section of his very early book, *Drift and Mastery* (1914) is devoted to demonstrating "the inadequacy of Marx for the present age." As befitted the time, this demonstration was enveloped in compliments concerning Marx' great vision. But the garlands were distributed in order to camouflage the knife-thrust: "Marxians are out of touch with the latent forces of this age"; they are, in fact, "largely sterile". The substance of Lippmann's arguments as to this point need not detain us here. It is due him to say, however, that they contain all the arguments advanced by him or by anyone else in the course of the subsequent forty years' campaign to show how outmoded Marxism really is.

When the Bolshevik Revolution demonstrated Marxism's "sterility," Lippmann applied himself to the noble task of "choking the infant in its cradle." In this behalf he was a chief author of Wilson's Fourteen Points, issued in January, 1918. This was an effort to offset the impact of that Revolution and the public release by the Bolsheviks of the terms of the secret treaties which were the reality behind the imperialists' slogan of "Peace Without Victory"—also coined by Lippmann. In this connection, too, did he view the conception of a League of Nations.

At the Paris Peace Council, where Lippmann played a role, he felt the United States was *the* barrier against the Bolshevizing of Europe. He reported early in 1919 that "Lenin and Liebknecht sit in the Council at Paris, and that their voices are heard in every discussion." Lippmann insisted that, "It is with them the world is negotiating today for its own preservation", thus very early consigning Soviet Russia to some other planet.

At the negotiations of the victorious imperialist powers Lippmann was troubled by the squabbles and differences amongst themselves and their vindictiveness towards the defeated nations, for he felt that everything should be subordinated to a united coalition—a sort of premature NATO—to destroy Bolshevism. It was the failure to solidify this as firmly as he wished that caused Lippmann to resign his services and return to the United States.

In *The Political Scene*, published in 1919, Lippmann warned:

The reason why Lenin may succeed is that the victors do not take seriously enough what he represents. They are frightened to be sure, they are even panicky, but they are not serious enough about the menace to be willing to subordinate every other consideration to the creation of a Europe which will be sterile to Bolshevism.

Lippmann called for "not a sanitary cordon, but a sanitary Europe," including a revived Germany, and this sanitary Europe, "under the aegis of the League is preliminary to the final problem of dealing with Lenin." He thought such a program—plus internationalizing the European and Pacific ports of Russia—rather than armed intervention, with all its risks, might end Bolshevism. He glimpsed something of the mass release that Bolshevism represented and called it "primitive, formless." Hence he held that conventional military repression would fail, for the conquest of Bolshevism was an altogether different kind of a problem from that of "occupying a capital and a few strategic points."*

From that time to the present Lippmann has sought incessantly and conscientiously to devise a foreign policy that would destroy the USSR. And, to the same end, he has tried to discover some magical device that would tear out of capitalism the roots of its replacement by Socialism. Fabianism, Fordism, Keynesism have beguiled him in turn—the

* It is in the context of this opposition to military intervention that one is to read the magnificent editorial in *The New Republic* of January 28, 1920, denouncing the lies about Soviet Russia in the *New York Times* and other commercial papers as "the father of lies." These were deceptions promulgated to bolster an impossible and stupid program, doomed to failure—an irresponsible blunder which to Lippmann, then and now, is inexcusable.

latter with lasting impact—but these he has viewed as more or less useful tactical devices. The main enemy was Democracy itself, the sovereignty of the people, and against this idea as being at the nub of the challenge to "free enterprise," Lippmann has waged a many-sided assault, culminating in the all-out attack in his latest volume.

The relationship of Socialism and democracy is, as Lenin has said, organic; the most determined enemies of both have also recognized, in their own distorted fashion, this relationship. This is, indeed, a main theme of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Hence, there it is written:

Democracy of the West today is the forerunner of Marxism, which would be inconceivable without it. It is democracy alone which furnishes this universal plague with the soil in which it spreads.

Again:

The parliamentary principle of decision by majority, by denying the authority of the person and placing in its stead the number of the crowd in question, sins against the aristocratic basic idea of nature.

Dozens of such quotations may be culled from Hitler. The idea in them is central to the thinking of other fascists or precursors of fascism, as the Italians, Pareto and Mosca. Indeed, the latter's very influential work, *The Ruling Class*, first published in 1923, should be read with Lippmann's latest opus to see how strikingly similar they are.

Mosca stated in so many words that his system of elitism was offered as a refutation of democracy, without which refutation there was no escaping the inexorable logic of Socialism.

Socialism will be arrested only [he wrote] . . . if the discovery and demonstration of the great laws that manifest themselves in all human societies [i.e., Mosca's elitism] succeed in making visible to the eye the impossibility of realizing the democratic ideal. On this condition, and on

this condition only, will the intellectual classes escape the influence of social democracy and form an invincible barrier to it.*

Lippmann has been insisting for over a generation that the source of the difficulties of our era lies in attachment to the erroneous idea of democracy, which has necessarily resulted in disastrous efforts at its implementation.

In an essay published in 1922, Lippmann announced "the absence of a really friendly and drastic criticism of democratic ideas." His writings have been filling this alleged void, with the emphasis on drastic, not friendly. Indeed, his book published that same year—*Public Opinion*—is such a criticism. For its theme is that democracy assumes the existence of an informed and rational public opinion, while in fact the assumption is quite false. As a result, the truth is that any community which is large and has heterogeneous interests will have to be governed and is really governed "only by a specialized class whose personal interests reach beyond the locality."***

Moreover, he went on, "this class is irresponsible" and that is how it must be. The origin of power is of no consequence, only the use of power matters, he maintained. And, though Lippmann did not say this, his position clearly assumes that there is no relationship between the source of power and the use to which it is put. Here, then, the mythical entity of Power serves to destroy class and make questions like democracy or autocracy or oligarchy unreal catch-phrases for election time or bed-time. Present, too, in this classlessness that so well serves Lippmann's anti-democracy, is another idealist construction that runs through all his political writing. Not only is Power divorced from any social reality, but also the State is quite divorced from any class definition, that is, has no relationship with any real State that has ever existed.

* Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class* (N.Y., 1939), p. 327, italics added. See the very valuable study by Raymond Barkley, "The Theory of the Elite and the Mythology of Power" in *Science & Society*, Spring, 1955.
** Implicit here is a valid insight, explicit in Madison and Calhoun, that only in a homogenous society—one without exploiting classes—could there be a fully democratic, non-oppressive state.

Lippmann has attacked, in books going back to the 'twenties—like *Men of Destiny* and *American Inquisitors*—what he calls "the dogma of majority rule" from another angle—that of so-called "liberalism". In the name of liberty, democracy is assaulted. Here is an example of this approach taken from the latter book named above (1928):

The advancement of human liberty has as a matter of practical politics consisted in building up centers of resistance against the absolutism of the reigning sovereigns. . . . Whoever the sovereign, the program of liberty is to deprive him of arbitrary and absolute power. In our age the power of majorities tends to become arbitrary and absolute.

Again observe how the myth of Power—divorced from class origins and functions—serves to bolster the power of the ruling class. This, too, serves to obscure the fact that "the advancement of human liberty" has come as the result of mass struggle against reactionary ruling classes, something which Lippmann avoids in all his earlier writings, and denies in his later work. Further, it hides the fact that this advancement has come with and has meant the enhancement of the rights and powers of more and more of the people, reaching its highest point, in theory, in the conception of sovereignty as inhering in the people. This idea of the sovereign people negates, of course, the original idea of sovereignty—that is, the omnipotence of the Sovereign *over* the people.

Of course, in origin, liberty to the bourgeoisie meant the liberty of accumulating property and inequality in property ownership was a hallmark of such "liberty". Lippmann, advocate par excellence of the bourgeoisie, repeats this word for word a century and a half after its progressive potential, relative to feudalism, has been squeezed dry: "Private property," he wrote in *The Method of Freedom* (1934), "was the original source of freedom" and "it is still its main bulwark."

What is bothering Mr. Lippmann is that of which the Founding Fathers already had a sharp premonition when creating our Constitution. Madison, for example, in the Convention, June 26, 1787, put the matter clearly:

In framing a system which we wish to last for ages, we should not lose sight of the changes which ages will produce. An increase of population will of necessity increase the proportion of those who will labor under all the hardships of life, and secretly sigh for a more equal distribution of its blessings. These may in time outnumber those who are placed above the feelings of indigence. According to the equal laws of suffrage, the power will slide into the hands of the former. No agrarian attempts have yet been made in this country, but symptoms of a leveling spirit, as we have understood, have sufficiently appeared in certain quarters to give notice of the future danger.

These are the deeper meanings of the cries of the Convention delegates concerning the need to check "democracy," of democracy's "horrors" and "dangers." To this is to be added the fact that even advanced 18th century political scientists—like Paine, Madison, Alfieri, etc.—thought of the "People" in almost as limited a sense as some individuals now think of "Society," i.e., as the "400."

The solution for the 18th century bourgeoisie—seeking victory over feudalism and/or colonialism, and needing mass support—was to contrive a government which protected private property and its unequal distribution while maintaining the republican form—that is, their solution, then, was bourgeois-democracy. The contradiction already sensed by leading bourgeois-democrats in the 18th century and already very much limiting the "democracy" established, becomes overwhelming to imperialist theoreticians of the 20th century—including Walter Lippmann. Their resolution of the contradiction is to deny democracy altogether the better to preserve the now aged bourgeoisie.

Another facet of the attack upon democracy is to deny the people's *capacity* to govern. Organic to the idea of popular sovereignty is popular capacity, and if the latter can be attacked successfully then the former falls.

Again, Mr. Lippmann has anticipated, in his earlier writing, the vast current outpouring relative to the inherent evil of humanity, its irrationalism and its rottenness making

resignation the only responsible attitude and contrition the only moral posture.

Adherents of democracy, he wrote back in 1925, "encourage the people to attempt the impossible"—that is, to exercise sovereignty, and this can only result in their "interfering outrageously with the productive activities of the individual." This must at all costs be avoided "so that each of us may live free of the trampling and the roar of a bewildered herd." Even earlier, in his *Public Opinion*, Lippmann seized on the behaviorism of J. B. Watson (his book, *Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist* appeared in 1919) to bulwark his attack on democracy. For the mechanical behaviorist view of thinking as pure stimulus and response—of the human brain as a mere switchboard—was the source for Lippmann's invention of the concept of mental "stereotypes." With this, Lippmann reduced the "reality" of democracy to the manipulation of the "herd's" mind by the propagandistic conditioning conducted by the elite. Similarly, psychoanalysis and pragmatism appealed to Lippmann—as did eugenics for a time—as scientific demonstrations of the irrational and amoral nature of man, as clinchers that the masses, in Mencken's phrase, were the "boohoisie."

In his *Preface to Morals* (1929) Lippmann announced men to be at last "free" and therefore corrupt. "There are," he proclaimed, "no conventions, no tabus, no gods, no priests, princes, fathers, or revelations which they must accept. . . . The prison door is wide open. They stagger out into trackless space under a blinding sun." The freedom is intolerable, for the free are incapable and so the liberated one "put on manacles to keep his hands from trembling." It is these members of the bewildered herd who "drug themselves with pleasure . . . who have made the moving pictures and the popular newspapers what they are."

The unrestrained language reflects the emotion of an offended and frightened snob, but more consequential is the never-never land that Lippmann must construct to make reasonable his vicious attack on the masses. "The prison

door is wide open", indeed. "Free to make their own lives", indeed. Such travesties are beneath refutation. They are indulged in lest the prison doors really be opened. They are part of Lippmann's systematic slander of the masses—the reverse side of his theory of the elite.

We suffer, wrote Lippmann in his attack on the New Deal disguised under the title, *Inquiry into the Principles of the Good Society* (1937), from "The Illusion of Control" which must have been news to the thirteen million then unemployed. The fact is, at any rate, he insisted, that "there is no possibility that men can understand the whole process of social existence." Forgetting "the limitations of men" has been our central error. Men cannot plan their future for "they are unable to imagine it" and they cannot manage a civilization, for "they are unable to understand it." To think otherwise, to dare to believe that the people can and should govern themselves, that they can and should forge social systems and governments enhancing the pursuit of their happiness here on earth—this is "the gigantic heresy of an apostate generation."

Hence, Lippmann's *Principles of a Good Society* came down, after all the elevated language, to the "rugged individualism" spelled out by its personification, Herbert Hoover, in his *The Challenge to Liberty* (1934).

That Lippmann believes in the incapacity of the mass and the heretical nature of the movement to make democracy fully meaningful does not mean that he closes his eyes to the urgent reality of that movement. This is why, as we have seen, Lippmann views Socialism as a central question of our day and has labored to make the bourgeoisie comprehend the fullness of its challenge.

Thus, another important aspect of Lippmann's thinking is his correct insistence that the modern world is marked by a decisive change as compared with previous epochs. That decisive change lies in the fact that capitalism has created

a technology capable of freeing men of want, poverty, illiteracy and even, very largely, of disease. It has also produced the working class which can transform the social order so that the technical possibilities of developed capitalism may be fully realized and—with Socialism—infininitely enhanced. The elimination of exploitation, oppression, poverty and war becomes, then, in our era, for the first time, a practical possibility and, indeed, the process of the elimination of the old and the creation of the new is *the* characteristic of that era.

Lippmann, of course, does not express the change in these terms, but he senses its quality. This is already present in his pre-World War I book, *Drift and Mastery*, where he wrote that "men have to substitute purpose for tradition: and that is, I believe, the profoundest change that has ever taken place in human history." Even where he is most contemptuous of the masses, this change is on his mind. Thus, in *A Preface to Morals* he found, "The peculiarity of our modern situation is that multitudes instead of a few, are compelled to make radical and original adjustments."

As so often happens with Lippmann, the clearest expression of this thought occurs in a speech—this one delivered at the University of California in March, 1933. The idea, he said, "that a social order can and should be planned and managed, has taken root among the people themselves and the sovereign power is in their hands." Hence, "the determining element of this age," he held, was "the conscious effort by the mass of men to produce an ordered society."

So, while Lippmann views this as heretical, he sees it as real and potent. He doesn't like it, but he never forgets it.

This reality leads Lippmann to emphasize the need for style, finesse, deftness on the part of the rulers. He wants a refined exploitation. In his first book, *A Preface to Politics* (1913) he warned:

There is something pathetic in the blindness of powerful people when they face a social crisis. Fighting viciously every readjustment . . . they make their own overthrow

inevitable. . . . When far-sighted men appear in the ruling classes—men who recognize the need of a civilized answer to this increasing restlessness, the rich and the powerful treat them to a scorn and a hatred that are incredibly bitter . . . [it] is enough to make an observer believe that the rich of today are as stupid as the nobles of France before the Revolution.

Even in his bitter attack against the New Deal, as formulated in *The Good Society*, where he explicitly agrees with the Tory thinking of Herbert Spencer, he disagrees with Spencerian tactics. He does not want moss-back reactionary attitudes which may encourage "the common ruin of property." This has been and remains a constant ingredient in Lippmann's thinking, though he limits the area of permissible concession as imperialism grows older.

This leads Lippmann to urge that the bourgeois bethink themselves of the usefulness of benevolence. Indeed, Lippmann is a pioneer in propagandizing for the idea of the "industrial statesman" rather than the capitalist, for the idea of the tycoons as "creators of national growth" rather than robber barons. In his earliest book, the independently wealthy young man appealed for businessmen "released from the stupid fixation upon the silly little ideals of accumulating dollars." He went on:

Instead of telling business men not to be greedy, we should tell them to be industrial statesmen, applied scientists, and members of a craft. Politics can aid that revolution in a hundred ways: by advocating it, by furnishing schools that teach, laboratories that demonstrate, by putting business on the same plane of interest as the Health Service.

By his next book, *Drift and Mastery*, published a year later (1914), Mr. Lippmann announced the realization of his proposal, and anticipated the kernel of Burnham's *Managerial Revolution*. Wrote Lippmann:

The real news about business, it seems to me, is that it is being administered by men who are not profiteers. The managers are on salary, divorced from ownership and from

bargaining. They represent the revolution in business incentives at its very heart. For they conduct gigantic enterprises and they stand outside the higgling of the market. . . . The motive of profit is not their personal motive. That is an astounding change.

Astounding—yes, and somewhat prematurely announced. Twenty years later, Mr. Lippmann was writing on "Big Businessmen of Tomorrow" (*The American Magazine*, April, 1934) which proposed for that "tomorrow" what Mr. Lippmann had found already to be fact in 1914. Still, in 1934, he felt it was certain for that tomorrow. Then, he was sure, businessmen would see their positions as places of public trust, not as sources of private accumulation. "They will work for honor, distinction, for promotion, for the interest and excitement and satisfaction of the work itself."

The theme recurs in later writings by Lippmann; he has labored hard to get across the "stereotype" of the sacrificial businessman to the thundering herd, but with little success. He faces an insurmountable obstacle to which he alluded—also in 1934—when he was somewhat impatient with what he thought was the naivete afflicting some New Dealers. Recovery, he wrote, could come only if the government encouraged large-scale investments by capitalists. And, he bluntly pointed out:

They will not do it to earn a Blue Eagle. They will not do it for patriotism's sake or as an act of public service. They will do it because they see a chance to make money. That is the way it works. (*N.Y. Herald Tribune*, July 13, 1934).

It is worth noting that with all of Lippmann's verbiage about the need for elasticity in ruling, his own record is markedly unimaginative and rigid. He was opposed to a minimum wage law, and denounced the Wagner Labor Act. His taxation policy has been about that of Mellon, and he has generally favored a sales tax. He was one of the first to raise the demand for the illegalization of the Communist Party (in 1944 in his book, *U. S. War Aims*). He has always supported colonialism and repeatedly denounced the idea of

self-determination. His foreign policy has generally revolved around the theme of how best to weaken the Soviet Union and achieve the hegemony of U.S. imperialism. It is in connection with these policies that Lippmann pioneered in proposing an "Atlantic Community" (his phrase)—an idea basic to the Cold War and one that is rooted in policy he projected, as we have seen, right after World War I.

Mr. Lippmann's lifelong assault upon democracy is systematized in his recent *Essays in the Public Philosophy*. Its appearance is a hallmark of the increasing rejection of bourgeois-democracy that characterizes the era of intensified monopoly capitalism. The Morgan partner, Thomas Lamont, in proposing a resolution of gratitude for Lippmann's services, at a dinner held in 1931, offered this ultimate praise: "Big business has always respected Mr. Lippmann's utterances. They have always been constructive."

Mr. Lippmann continues his services in his latest volume by presenting in his most civilized manner and as persuasively as his great talents and experiences permit, a *rationale* for declaring democracy defunct.

Naturally, at this time in this country, in the press that "matters" his work has been generally hailed. A professor of philosophy finds it "a classical model of diagnosis," the head of a history department in another college says Lippmann "speaks as a wise prophet," the head of a Catholic university hopes "that one hundred years from now it may be recognized as the opening gun of a powerful movement in political philosophy." Hopeful, however, and a sign of the turn against extreme reaction that has marked the past several months, some professors, notably H. H. Wilson of Princeton and Oscar Handlin of Harvard, have written strong criticisms of the volume.

The enemy, writes Lippmann, is "the Jacobin heresy" and that heresy is the one we have already encountered in his earlier works—i.e., the belief that humanity can and should

produce on earth a society of abundance, equality, freedom, and peace. This heresy is common to Jacobinism and to Leninism; it must be excised, else the "civilities" will cease. "The misrule of the people" explains "the decline of the West"; let us stop flattering them and admit to ourselves and convince them that their sovereignty is absurd and unworkable and, indeed, sinful.

Certainly, writes Lippmann, my philosophy "will impose a regime that is hard," but "the results of rational and disciplined government will be good." The emancipated herd is "lonely" (using Riesman) and "proletarianized" (using Toynbee) and actually seeks tradition and stability and order and our philosophy will provide all these. Disfranchisement is not advocated—no crudity, please—but representation should be "virtual", such as existed in 18th century England (and against which the American colonists rebelled, but of *that* source of the "heresy" we will not speak).

Popular opinion is and must be opposite to the public interest—this miraculous public interest contrived by Mr. Lippmann, though never really defined. But then Mr. Lippmann, being of the elite, knows the public interest when he sees it, and the one thing he is sure of is that his public interest is as public as the rich Englishmen's public school—that is to say, it is private. Mr. Lippmann has extended the myth of the classless state of his earlier writings to the myth of a classless public interest which is knowable only to a private, minute elite.

All is geared to the stability of private property. That stability needs flexibility, not rigidity, Lippmann still insists, and it entails duties—governing for instance—as well as rights, such as the wherewithal to live well, as befits the elite. In terms of flexibility, Lippmann rejects the tactical approach of the McCarthyites as being untimely, crude and unnecessary *at this juncture of events*. He has written, in one of his columns, that "the real trouble with the so-called Right-wing Republicans" is that they do not sufficiently take account of "the modern realities" and that "they are at odds with the

history of the times they live in." (January 10, 1955)

When Lippmann becomes specific as to the "errors" that popular sovereignty has produced in the past, he is positively ludicrous, of course. And he is ludicrous for two reasons: 1) The people really did not rule in his Western countries, as he well knows; 2) Policies followed by these Western countries were formulated by monopolists and to the degree that those policies were not modified by concessions to opposing public opinion, to that degree were they fully disastrous. This is true from the "rugged individualist" criminality of the elite Mr. Hoover and his gang to the foreign policy of the Cliveden Set—not to speak of the absolutely undiluted elitism of the Hitler-Mussolini-Hirohito Axis. It is not irrelevant to recall that it was John Foster Dulles—not a Jacobin heretic—who wrote, in 1939: "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war upon us."

Actually, the full implications of Lippmann's *Public Philosophy* were spelled out by him in certain columns that he was writing while doing that book. In October, 1954, he was in Italy, and he was appalled by the strength of the Left. He reported the Communist Party of Italy, "dominates the labor unions, is a growing power among the villagers in southern Italy, and it has great support and influence in the middle class." Mr. Lippmann continued:

The non-Communist parties are in control of the apparatus of the state, of the bureaucracy, the armed forces and the police. They will not, I have been told, surrender their sovereign power to the Communists if they fall behind in the count of heads. . . .

This decision within the governing party means, if it is as firm as it appears to be, that the Communists cannot take over the government without great violence. (October 19, 1954).

He returned to the same question in his next column. He had spoken, he said, with an eminent Italian about this question of democracy and Communism. The result is lengthy, but worth full quotation:

We have decided not to surrender the state to the Communists, not to allow them to take power even if circumstances were to give them the legal votes.

We shall use the whole force of the state to prevent their taking power legally. That in the last resort will be our answer to Communist propaganda. But of course the answer will require actions which will in fact put in charge of our affairs soldiers, policemen and men who are temporarily akin to fascists. So we avert the Communist danger but the price may be the loss of our democracy and our liberties.

Lippmann comments that "in principle this is the right decision." And he adds:

With weak democratic government there is a great danger that the democrats would simply be brushed aside, would abdicate their responsibilities, *and would leave the dirty work to be done by a minority*. If that is so, the great question arises as to whether the basic decision should not now be brought into the open, and publicly declared and its principle openly discussed and vindicated. (Oct. 21, 1954; italics added).

In *The Public Philosophy*, the language is not quite this explicit—it does not mention "the dirty work", for example—but the same program of the illegalization of "subversion", of the "heresy", in fact, is offered. It is the program, of course, of Brownell at home and of Dulles abroad, with his "internal aggression" clauses in his Asian and Latin-American pacts. It is a program to justify the domination of the world by an ultra-reactionary, coordinated, "sterilized" United States.

There is an additional element in Lippmann's current writing that requires attention. In accordance with his effort at responsible and sober reportage for his employers, Mr. Lippmann has been emphasizing in recent columns the reality of the world-wide mass demand for peace. He has also noted that in most of the world, because of her anti-war and anti-colonial stand, the U.S.S.R. does "stand forth as the champion of what the peoples want."

These pronouncements are to be read in the light of Lippmann's anti-democratic convictions and his belief that popular policies are invariably "bad" policies. When read in this light they carry additional weight, for Lippmann is telling his masters—pro-war and anti-Soviet as they are—to tread lightly and to move cautiously. He is reporting where the overwhelming direction of mass opinion is, and he knows as a practical matter something of what this means in terms of power. He therefore is in fact acknowledging the marvelously salutary influence of that mass opinion which Lippmann professes to despise. This, itself, is a decisive refutation of his *Public Philosophy*.

Lippmann's view of the masses and of their role is diametrically opposed to that of Marxism, which is the philosophy of the liberation of the masses by themselves. "When it is a question of a complete transformation of the social organization," wrote Engels in his introduction to *The Class Struggles in France*, "the masses themselves must also be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for with body and soul . . . no lasting victory is possible for them [Socialists] unless they first win the great mass of the people."

And as for these masses, Marxists evaluate their character, too, in a way quite opposite from Lippmann's. "The workers and peasants," said Stalin in 1933, "who work without fuss and noise . . . who create all the good things of life, who feed and clothe the whole world—they are the real heroes and the creators of the new life."

But one does not have to subscribe to Marxism to reject Lippmann's system of reaction. To Lippmann the great heresy is the idea of the masses having the capacity for building and maintaining a healthy social order, but Thomas Jefferson spoke of a different heresy: "the political heresy that man is incapable of self-government." "I am not," said Jefferson, "among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are the dependence for continued freedom."

Abraham Lincoln, too, put the same thought with characteristic simplicity and must be numbered among Lippmann's heretics. Speaking to his friend, Richard Oglesby in 1858, Lincoln said: "Remember, Dick, to keep close to the people—they are always right and will mislead no one."

There is a kinship in the words of Jefferson and Lincoln with those of Engels and Stalin because the liberation of the working class and of all humanity—the victory of Socialism—is in direct line with, an extension of, a leap forward from the limited liberating results of bourgeois-democracy.

The ideas of Lippmann are akin to those of enemies of democracy from Carlyle to Mosca to Hitler. They are contemptuous of the masses and threaten the interests of the masses. Their defeat in life requires mass unity and activity, in defense of democracy, of equality, and of peace.

JANUARY, 1955

The Cadillac Credo of David Riesman

THE MARKED INFLUENCE OF DAVID RIESMAN ON THE CURRENT intellectual scene makes timely an examination of his work. The reviewers have hailed Mr. Riesman's studies of American life as "startling" and "profound." The ultimate accolade came recently when *Time* put his picture on its cover and devoted four pages to his "wide-swinging imagination," to his "brilliant work" which, we are told, "has already a kind of classic stature."

Mr. Riesman was trained originally in the law and had a distinguished career therein: law clerk for Justice Brandeis; professor of law at Buffalo and Columbia Universities; and Assistant District Attorney in New York. Several years ago he turned his talents to social studies, and his successes here have been equally notable. Mr. Riesman is now Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, frequent contributor to leading journals and author of four widely read volumes.

The first of the four, and the best known, is *The Lonely Crowd*, published in 1950. It is now in its sixth printing, and an abridged paper-bound edition issued last year has sold over 60,000 copies. The other books are *Faces in the Crowd*; *Thorstein Veblen*; and most recently a collection of essays, *Individualism Reconsidered*.

The acclaim of his work surely is not fully accounted for on the grounds, as *Time* asserted, that Riesman answers the anguished city editor who cried: "What we need around this place is a new set of clichés." Mr. Riesman does produce a well-turned phrase. He writes with aplomb and marked so-

phistication. Part of this appears as disdain for what he calls the "hortatory"; to him this is ill-mannered and childish. Yet he himself is rather ardent when urging abstention from commitment, and the cultivation of the inconsequential.

"What Americans seem to us to need," writes Riesman, "in their politics as in their personal life, is greater scope for fantasy." He reproved an audience of his professional colleagues for getting "more involved than it makes any sense" for them to be. "I think we are so damn uninfluential we might as well have more fun . . . social scientists are much too involved with immediate devotion to contemporary issues. . . ."

Actually, however, this air of indifference is a carefully cultivated pose the better to get home his own thrusts in the direction of very central issues—*Time* will not waste a cover, and four costly pages on sheer fantasy. A survey of Mr. Riesman's writings suggests that when he urges social scientists not to become involved in contemporary issues, he means for them to become so involved, but as partisans of Big Business.

Indeed, Mr. Riesman at times disarmingly admits this partisanship. Commenting on the present close ties between businessmen and educators, he declares that "in a curious way this close connection also limits understanding, for it is hard not to share the hopes and fears of those who treat us well." Similarly, Riesman was moved to write—in a *Partisan Review* symposium—"It is hard for us not to feel we are selling out when our views (let us say, our discovery of the virtues of bourgeois 'capitalism') not only keep us out of trouble but open up jobs or audiences for us."

What explains the great appeal that Riesman's writings have for so many middle-class professionals and intellectuals? Some of the answer lies in his extraordinary verbal dexterity. Mr. Riesman combines deftness and orthodoxy with a sense of boldness and innovation in the passion of his devotion to the values of monopoly capitalism. Another ingredient is the way in which he uses psycho-analytical jargon and concepts to

attack the feelings of malaise and anxiety that afflict those for whom he particularly writes.

The anxiety of many middle-class intellectuals derives from a rootlessness and a parasitism; from being charmed with the flesh-pots offered by the rich, but repelled by the crassness of their values and the imbecilities of their thinking. The anxiety derives, too, from a sense of the precariousness of their position, from memories of depression and breadlines, from fears of wars.

Now, here comes a man with impressive academic regalia who tells his readers to forget their feelings of guilt, of unease. He tells them to take seriously their labors—the ads they write, the novels they knock together, the speeches they ghost, the smart lessons they impart to still-expectant youth. He tells them that here in the United States all are well off and all are equal, and art flourishes, and there is nothing to feel guilty about any longer. And he tells them that this will last forever, so there is no longer any reason for uneasiness.

For a good many of the readers to whom Riesman's work is geared this view might well appear quite reasonable. They "never had it so good"—and the fact that the Wall Street economy is bloated on the blood of World War II, is stimulated by the preparations for another one, and further sustained by the super-profits squeezed out of a subordinate "free world" and its colonial appurtenances, does not concern or interest them. That they confuse limited stretches of Madison, Park and Fifth Avenues with New York City, and their plush Suburbias with the United States, only serves to add apparent veracity to Riesman's tale.

Further, Riesman tells these people, who never can quite shed their troubled feelings, that their anxieties are hallmarks of their superiority; they are of the élite, the "saving remnant" are his words. "I am inclined to think," he writes, "that we should form a union of the anxious ones, to defend our right to be anxious, our right to be tense. . . ."

The anxiety is the burden of the superior, of the "autonomous" ones, those who are "capable of conscious self-direction,"

unlike the masses of people, the inferior ones, the "heteronomous," those who are "guided by voices other than their own," and who are "helpless." How comforting and how satisfying to the never-inconsiderable ego of the petty-bourgeois "individualist"!

The only thing really new about these "discoveries" is the verbiage. If one considers Riesman's account of the American economy, the glories of the bourgeoisie and the aggressiveness of his Babbity, one finds that it is, in substance, indistinguishable from the propaganda of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce for the past fifty years. Anyone may confirm this by reading, for example, two very recent studies of that propaganda, *The Self-Made Man in America* by Irvin G. Wyllie (Rutgers University Press), and *Dollar Decade* by James W. Prothro (Louisiana State University Press).

A problem, nevertheless, remains, and it is part of the anxiety. This problem is "loneliness"; a problem that Riesman ascribes, of course, not to the actual estrangement of the lonely one from the realities of life, not to his devotion to values of decay, not to his prostitution of talents on behalf of exploiters, not to his precious "individualism" which really brings the destruction of the individual. No, the loneliness for Riesman is an immutable quality of human existence and one "which intellectuals face today with specialized acuteness."

It is an "insoluble" problem; it is one, says Riesman, that Franz Kafka expressed so sensitively in his novels. ("The desire for death," wrote Kafka, "is the beginning of wisdom"). There is nothing to be done about it, except to live with it and to develop the "nerve of failure"; to be aware that this terrible loneliness is there and cannot be eradicated and is a badge of one's superiority. All right, says Riesman, that is the penalty. Live with it; do not fight it for it cannot be overcome, and in the name of sanity, don't feel guilty about it.

Another attraction for Riesman's work for his rather specialized, but potent audience, is its main area of concentration. His works are what he calls characterological studies, that is,

studies of personality. And he is specifically interested in the personality of the American as this personality is shaped today, that is, in an America which now has, says Riesman, an economy of abundance. This economy, he says, is new and it has a unique impact upon the people living in it. All this is subject matter of the greatest interest to the main Riesman audience, many of whom earn their livings on the basis of the effectiveness with which they can divine that personality, discover what appeals to it in fiction, the radio, television, movies, in ads, in college, etc.

The alleged American economy of abundance has produced the "other-directed" personality; primitive societies had "tradition-directed" people; societies which were not primitive but which had not conquered the problem of production and distribution had "inner-directed" people. Now, in the United States there are some "inner-directed" people still, who will be rather moralistic and conscience-stricken. They "lack the proper receiving equipment for the radar signals" sent out by our abundant society. They may be members of "minority groups" who are "not approved . . . in the value hierarchy," or they may be people "whose ancestry is adequate" but "whose 'personality' in subtle ways lacks the pliability and sensitivity to others, that is required."

These regressive folk, these people who have not yet caught up with what Berle and the Luce corps of writers call *The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution*, are the ones filled with "resentment and rebellion." The really progressive ones are those who understand the qualitative change, appreciate the "revolution," adjust to it, and are "other-directed."

Now, in understanding all this, the ideas of Freud are decisive, and precisely because, as Riesman says, Freud was so "definitely bourgeois." Some of the pioneering crudities of Freud are to be discounted, and so Riesman states he is most heavily indebted to Erich Fromm. Thus, Riesman does not feel that individual psychology is *the* shaper of politics; no, he holds "that politics shaped individual psychology quite as much as the other way around. . . ."

The improvement is formal and considering the blows that orthodox Freudianism has received, is really necessary if one is to keep its essential ideas and still make an effective argument. Attributing to "individual psychology" the same significance as "politics" in terms of comprehending politics (i.e., social science) results in idealistic psychology and politics; it illuminates neither the one nor the other.

In terms of practice, as is inevitable, Riesman makes his "personality" analysis decisive in his politics. This is true in detail—as when he ascribes the impact of Bellamy's Utopian Socialist novel, *Looking Backward*, to the desire of its readers to escape from the real world, or when he attributes Henry Ford's anti-Semitism to the alleged fact that Ford was "pro-underdog" and so he "was going to be for Hitler and Gerald K. Smith" because "all the good people in his circle seemed to be down on them"—or in the large as when he explicitly says that "we shall regard politics as one of the spheres . . . of the characterological struggle."

Just as Frederick Jackson Turner built a system predicated on the fundamental uniqueness of the United States in an effort to refute Marxism in history, so David Riesman builds such a system in an effort to defeat Marxism in sociology. He announces that Marxism is irrelevant to the present American scene. He believes that the reality of this scene completely belies Marxism, and that, therefore, Communists, firmly attached to obsolete frames of reference, have now in fact, "become perhaps the most reactionary and most menacing force."

Clearly the validity of Mr. Riesman's system fundamentally depends upon the answers to two inter-related questions: 1) How true is his characterization of Marxism?; 2) How true is his picture of the present-day United States?

Riesman's explicit references to Marxism are scattered throughout his works. They add up to a "Marxism" which is the caricature presented today in academic circles: rigid, mechanical, unimaginative, and inhuman. Riesman's "Marx-

ism" is the crassest kind of economic determinism. To show that as irrelevant is easy—and is itself irrelevant to Marxism.

Riesman presents Marxism as a system for which ideas are unimportant, scientific objectivity a snare, and human beings simple, manipulative creatures. Irrational behavior does not exist, psychic phenomena are ignored and, in general, activities of the brain—the whole world of art and culture, of wonder and imagination — are "attacked as superstructural" or as reflections of "mere idle curiosity."

This Riesman-Marxism is "a fatalistic creed," favoring a "medieval type of guild harmony." Riesman's Marx saw capitalism as a social order that "would burn out" all "pecuniary, nationalistic, and mystical ways of thought" and since this has not happened, Marxism is impotent. Specifically, ponder the power of nationalism, a power which leaves "Marxism" dumbfounded, since it represents a sentiment quite outside its ken and one which capitalism was supposed to have "burned out." Moreover, this "Marxism" sees workers as possessing only a one-to-one relationship to their direct class interests and so is powerless to recognize, let alone explain, the irrational hold of nationalism upon them.

At times, Riesman's summarizations of "what Marx really meant" reach the ludicrous. Thus: "Marx seemed to have believed that crisis resulted from the competition of firms within each industry." It is hardly necessary to comment on the substance of this, but here please note, "Marx seemed. . ." Apparently Marx's views on capitalist crisis have to be divined from some remote and obscure source and not (as pre-Riesman students of Marx had hitherto believed) from part 1 of the first volume of *Capital*, part 3 of the second volume, most of the third volume, and the last third of his *Theories of Surplus Value*.*

* Though, as I have said, references to Marxism are liberally scattered throughout Riesman's work, specific citation to sources is almost never given. An exception helps demonstrate, rather amusingly, the shoddiness of the sheer scholarship that characterizes American academic treatment of this nearly-illegal subject. In one place (*Individualism Reconsidered*, p. 450) he quotes from Lenin's *Selected Works* (IX, p. 35)—crediting a colleague for calling this to his attention—but in the quotation Riesman changes tenses throughout, and where Lenin jokingly refers to himself as an "underground lawyer," Riesman renders this as "undergraduate lawyer"!

Marxism's view is dialectical materialist, not economic determinist, though it is actually the latter that Riesman is attacking. Marxism holds that nothing human is alien to it; it insists upon the materialist *origin* of ideas and this does not demean their significance. Marxism's constant struggle to develop socialist consciousness in the working class as necessary to that class' liberation sufficiently demonstrates that it is not a system given to deprecating the importance of ideas.

Nor does Marxism deny irrational behavior (for example, a white worker supporting Jim Crow); what Marxism does deny is that behavior, or anything else is inherently beyond explanation (for example, the white worker who supports Jim Crow does so because he is infected by the dominant ideas of a racist society, whose ruling class created and maintains that racism as both useful and profitable to itself).

The world of art and culture is not "attacked" as superstructural; that is, as arising from, while influencing, the material basis of the social order. Far from sneering at the world of creativity and imagination, Marxism holds, in Lenin's words: "You can become a Communist only by enriching your mind with the knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind." This is not unrelated to the fact that in the past half century many of the most talented treasure-builders have been Communists, from Barbusse to Dreiser, Gorky to Neruda, Nexo to Eluard.

Marxism is not fatalistic, for the essence of fatalism is predetermined occurrence regardless of man's will and activity, while the essence of Marxism is the inevitability of the defeat of capitalism and the victory of Socialism in very large part *because of the will and activity of men*—specifically of the working class and its allies. Again, in Lenin's words: "Above everything else he [Marx] put the fact that the working class heroically, self-sacrificingly and taking the initiative *makes world history*" (emphases in original).

Marxism holds that "pecuniary and nationalistic" ways of thought are not only not "burned out" by capitalism, but rather are peculiarly characteristic of capitalism and become

increasingly fierce as capitalism ages. Marxism was not non-plussed by nationalism; rather Marxism has analyzed this with extreme care and great thoroughness. Indeed, there is no single question wherein dialectical materialism has so clearly shown itself to be more profound and richer than other views. Marxism has shown nationalism's source and character, its role and influence both in the imperialist powers and in the oppressed countries.

How true is Riesman's depiction of the United States today? It is possible that his understanding of Marxism is quite faulty—as we have shown it to be—but that he portrays truly our country in a factual sense, and that this portrayal justifies him in finding Marxism irrelevant to that scene.

Mr. Riesman's system is, indeed, empirical, not philosophical. It stands or falls in terms of fact. Is he reporting American life truly?

Riesman's United States is that of Henry Luce, of Hollywood's *Executive Suite* and *A Woman's World*—not that of the vast majority of its 160,000,000 inhabitants.* First it is a country without a ruling class—this he repeats a dozen times. It is a country where the problems of production and distribution have been solved. In his United States there is an "over-privileged two-thirds" of the population; mankind's hopes for "abundance and equality" have been attained. "Cadillacs have been democratized," and so like Elysium is it that "only the crack-pot politicians have not virtually run out of promises."

American businessmen, says Riesman, do not seek profit (unlike backward European businessmen, who still do) but rather public approval and the satisfaction derived from a task well-done. So prevalent is abundance that wealth is no

* Occasionally Mr. Riesman warns his readers "of the limitations . . . of observational viewpoint" of his work—"middle and upper middle class"—but the warning is formal. In the body of his work he writes as though he were describing the people of the United States as a whole, and this certainly is the way in which his work has been read generally.

longer flaunted—the acquisitive consumer and ostentatious display have disappeared.

In Riesman's United States what he calls the middle-class numbers "more than half of the whole population in occupational terms, with an even larger number, measured in terms of income. . . ." There are workers, but one is not quite sure that Riesman is using the right term in calling them "workers," because the reason they "have so few problems with their leisure is that their work today is itself quite leisurely" and "since work has now become so relatively lacking in strain . . . the worker leaves the plant with a good deal of energy left, which carries him readily through his leisure hours."

With production conquered and abundance assured and work leisurely, why is it people put in a full day's labor? "The 'instinct of workmanship' still seems to be strong enough to make us want to spend eight hours a day at the factory or office, keeping ourselves busy in the rituals of conspicuous production."

All this, and dessert, too. Thus, our "moving pictures and poetry and criticism" mark our present culture as "one of the great cultures of history." And that Riesman really means great when he says great becomes apparent when one finds that he demands: "What is there in Pericles' famous praise of Athens that does not apply to us, in some or even in extended measure?"

Our author calls the country he describes the United States, but it is in fact Riesmania.

He substitutes assertion for demonstration as the methodology of social science; for certain of his opinions he adopts the technique of repeated assertion, notably in his insistence that there is no ruling class in the United States. The task of persuasion on this point is indeed onerous, and so the repetition reaches the point of monotony.

Here Mr. Riesman is most anxious, yet most unsure—the tongue constantly returns to the aching tooth. He admits that "many people still assume we have a ruling class." This is

because, he finds, people are prone to go out of their way "to create a series of demons" and they do this because they "are afraid of indeterminacy and amorphousness in the power situation," they "prefer to suffer with interpretations that give their world meaning."

This distorting simplicity, we are told, is most prevalent among workers—despite their leisure. Among them, "the image of a ruling class is very strong"; and, anticipating Defense Secretary Wilson, it is "the bottom dogs who feel there is a boss somewhere."

Who, then, rules? No one and every one. Fifty years ago, Riesman concedes, it was Wall Street, but today it is a myriad of "veto groups"—local realtors, lawyers, salesmen, undertakers, military men who control the armed forces, and labor leaders who control productivity, and writers and farmers, and the Russians, "who control much of our agenda of attention; and so on. The reader can complete the list!"

Every serious study of the United States shows that the dominant economic, political and ideological force in this country for the past three generations has been the monopolists. They have controlled the means of production and of communication; they have dominated both major political parties; they have fundamentally guided domestic and foreign policy. And what was true fifty years ago is true now—only more so, since the degree of monopolization has increased tremendously. Cadillacs have not been democratized; we have a Cadillac government. The people believe this not because they fear "indeterminacy" or want to suffer, or because they are dogs; they believe it because they see it and know it, despite contrary teachings inspired by the ruling class itself. They believe it because it is true.

In Riesmania over half the population, in occupational terms, and an even greater proportion in terms of income, is of the middle-class; indeed, the country contains an "over-privileged two-thirds." So our author reported in 1950; but it was David Riesman who wrote in 1941 that in the United States, "the underprivileged are not even technically free,"

and that these underprivileged consisted of "the great mass of Negroes, of white collar and factory workers, of tenant farmers" (*Common Sense*, November, 1941). Surely these together constitute a good deal more than a third of the population? It is true that the later Riesman has apologized* for his earlier writings as being acrid, satiric, vague and hortatory. But as between the two Riesmans, the one apologized for is the one who is right.

The Census reports that as of 1950 about 56,000,000 people in the United States were "employed," which includes all from Charles Wilson of General Motors to Joe Doakes. Of these the number of professional and technical employees, farm owners and farm managers, all other managers, officials, and proprietors totaled about 14,500,000; the number of clerical and sales workers, craftsmen, operatives, miners, household and service workers, farm laborers, and other laborers totaled about 41,500,000, so that, from the standpoint of occupations, while in Riesmania the middle-class is over half the population, in the United States it is not over a quarter of the population.

As for the status in terms of income, the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics announced, in 1951, that a family of four needed an annual income of \$4,166 to maintain "a minimum standard of health and decency." During that year 64 per cent of American families had incomes below that minimum, so that while in Riesmania there is an "over-privileged two-thirds," in the United States there is an "under-privileged" two-thirds.

In Riesmania there is an abundance and equality; in the United States, 5 per cent of the families, in 1953, had annual incomes of \$10,000 or more, while 69 per cent received less than \$5,000 a year. In the City of New York almost two million people are now living in apartments condemned as substandard in 1901! In the United States, areas officially classified as "slums" contain one-third of the entire population

* In his *Individualism Reconsidered*, pp. 15, 123. The essays collected in this are all post-Cold War products.

—and the number of slum dwellings is *increasing* at the rate of 4 per cent every year!

In the United States, in 1953, almost 8,500,000 people—unemployed, indigent aged, dependent children, impoverished blind and disabled—received monetary aid from the Federal government alone, a government notoriously miserly when it comes to welfare expenditures. In the City of New York, as these words are being written, almost 300,000 people are on the public relief rolls.

In Riesmania there is equality, but in the United States, the paper I am reading the day I write this (*N.Y. Times*, Dec. 7) tells of a slum fire that kills five children sleeping in their single bedroom, a mother who abandons two toddlers for she has been unable to get on relief and is unemployed, and a "society matron" up from Palm Beach about to cruise off to Europe, happy that the police have recovered "\$70,000 worth of diamonds, opals, and amethysts" that now may adorn her as she relaxes aboard ship.

In Riesmania there is equality, but in the United States there are 20,000,000 Negro, Mexican and Puerto Rican people victimized by a racism as blatant and devastating as exists in the world.

In Riesmania the workers enjoy leisure at their jobs; in the United States one finds the home of speedup. In the United States work loads have jumped from 33 per cent to 100 per cent in the past five years, accidents have multiplied, and strikes against speed-up have broken out in the Armour plant in Chicago, the Great Lakes Steel plant and the Nash-Kelvinator plant in Michigan, in General Motors, Ford, B. F. Goodrich. . . .

In Riesmania, rituals of conspicuous production induce people to put in a day's work in factory and office; in the United States it's the harassing rat-race to get the where-withal to buy food and pay rent and get shoes and meet the doctor's bills that gets the workers into the plants and drives nearly 5,000,000, now unemployed, frantic in their search for work.

In Riesmania businessmen do not seek profits; in the United States they live for and kill for profits. In Riesmania, ostentatious display is gone; in the United States, the Stotesburys spend \$650,000 a year to operate their Florida home, and Bergdorfs on Fifth Avenue sells hats, priced at \$60, for dogs.

As to Riesman's announcement that he finds culture here and now to rival that of Athens at its glory, it is fair to add that elsewhere he admits that this culture "escapes my efforts at interpretation. . . . I have a sense of only a very small fragment of what goes on." So, in a fragmentary, and quite contradictory way, he will comment that he observes "a real fear of books" in the country, and elsewhere he wonders: "Why are Americans often so anxious and unhappy . . . young people so frequently aimless. . . . Why in intellectual circles is there so much malice? . . . The American culture, high, low, and middle, nearly always lacks the gamut of qualities our best and creative spirits have evoked and represented." Yes, in Riesmania one has a Periclean Age; the ruling-class culture of the United States is Spillanean.

Mr. Riesman's structure of American uniqueness, then, is found to be most insecure and unsatisfactory because the "Marxism" to which he is taking exception, is not Marxism but is a clap-trap concoction of his own, put up in order to be knocked down; and his picture of the United States, the validity of which is absolutely basic to his structure, is found to be grossly untrue.

Nevertheless, there is still this to be said. Though Mr. Riesman's work is of great value to the ruling class and belongs to the "New Conservatism," it is not fully embraced by all its devotees. Russell Kirk (a Right-wing Conservative!) is troubled by Riesman's secularism. Riesman, says Kirk in *A Program for Conservatives*, does not see that "the crowd's loneliness is the consequence of a flight from God," and so his remedies, while sufficiently respectful of the "elite" are not sufficiently attuned to the needs for increased mysticism, a refurbished medievalism.

It is also true that the present Riesman, in his very latest writings, has expressed a certain uneasiness as thought-control becomes more flagrant. In the introduction to his 1954 volume he feels called upon to declare: "I am hostile even to the best excuses for censoring ideas." And in that book while he reprints his essay in *The American Scholar* (written in 1953) attacking Archibald MacLeish for having warmly denounced McCarthyism, he appends a post-script which is in fact an apology. He thinks now that "even the most intrepid among us may secretly long for reasons for inactivity," a longing to be resisted because of the increasing "erosions of intellectual freedom." He reiterates his anti-Communism, but, at the same time, announces he is tired of this act of "piety," of announcing one's anti-Communism, and, of very great importance, indeed, he says that the danger of McCarthyism is pressing and great.

This is more nearly like the young attorney of the New Deal days who attacked Holmes' "clear and present danger" dictum as in fact chipping away at the First Amendment, and who insisted that when that Amendment said Congress shall make no law infringing the right of free speech, it meant *no* law, and that nothing—not war or anything else—justified any exceptions. That attorney, then, found the Smith Act one which "must fail of ethical justification" because it infringed on the First Amendment and because its language was "vague and meaningless." That attorney, then, saw that "it is the fascist danger that has been important" and that "the activities of the Dies Committee" were really "a blind for an attack on liberals."*

When Riesman found fault, in 1953, with MacLeish, he did so because he thought he heard breast-beating of a "guilty" intellectual, an "inner-directed" soul not attuned to the New America, still unaware of and unadjusted to the 20th century capitalist revolution.

Yet, writing at the close of 1954 Mr. Riesman, as we have

* These writings are in: *Public Policy* (Yearbook of Graduate School, Harvard, 1942); and *Journal of Legal and Political Sociology*, October, 1942.

seen, is candid enough to admit error in this attack. He confesses that the reality of the danger to intellectual freedom was much greater than he had thought; that he had misjudged the political and ideological scene, and that MacLeish was not being regressive, but was being perceptive and seeing more clearly than Mr. Riesman.

Can Riesman go on from there? Perhaps other aspects of the reality he depicts in his books are equally askew? Perhaps Mr. Riesman can once again see the viciousness of the Smith Act, the malicious nature of the Dies-McCarthy witchhunting, and the very real danger of fascism?

Certainly, the realities of American life today are leading many intellectuals to re-examine their ideas and assumptions, and, in many cases, to dedicate themselves to fighting the threat of fascism. It is only in this common struggle that the "aimlessness" and the "malice" which Riesman laments can be overcome. It is in this way that there will be recreated the finest qualities of "our best and most creative spirits."

FEBRUARY, 1953

Communism and Truth: A Reply to Sidney Hook

After the recent wave of firings of university teachers in New York City, Professor Sidney Hook, head of the Department of Philosophy of New York University, wrote a long article in a student newspaper upholding these assaults on academic freedom. Hook, notorious as a mouthpiece of "liberalized" McCarthyism and war-bent imperialism, declared that "no present member of the Communist Party can honestly fulfill his vocation or his unspoken commitment as a scholar and teacher to the ethics and logic of objective, scientific inquiry."

Shortly thereafter a group of students from New York University visited this writer and invited him to challenge Hook to a public debate on the issues raised. The writer sent such a challenge. The further story is explained in the public letter to Hook that follows.

I HAVE RECEIVED YOUR LETTER, DATED DECEMBER 12TH, IN WHICH you reject my proposal to publicly debate your false assertion that the Communist Party of the United States is conspiratorial and that a Communist is incapable of scientific, objective inquiry.

Though the letter is dated December 12, it is postmarked December 17 and was received the next day. Friends tell me that my note to you and your two thousand word reply have already been printed in a university newspaper—this explains, I suppose, your waiting a week before sending me your letter, thus making sure that no reply to it appeared in the same issue. I found it interesting, also, that you sent a carbon copy of this letter. To whom did the original go?—J. Edgar Hoover, or was it to another of your fellow anti-Communist savants—like Howard Rushmore, or Walter Winchell, or Martin Dies?

Tell me, Professor, do you teach ethics, too, in your Department of Philosophy?

Enough, however, for the externals of your letter. Let us turn, now—taking a deep breath and exhaling slowly—to the contents of the letter.

You begin your epistle, in a characteristically modest manner, by saying that you will not debate with me, for you do not desire to "help build up an audience" for me; and you end your delightful missive, in a characteristically rapacious manner, by urging that I extend *your* audience by publishing it in *Masses & Mainstream*! Really, Professor, I think you should head the Department of Business Administration rather than the Department of Philosophy—or is there no longer a distinction between the two?

You add that you would no sooner debate with me than you would with a Nazi "who offered to debate me to prove that Hitler was not really an anti-Semite." Well, now, in the first place no Nazi would want to prove any such thing, and in the second place you most certainly are not debating these days with Nazis or fascists, at all, are you? No, you, and the ruling class that pays you, are, with the Nazis, frothing at the mouth to get your fangs once again into the living flesh of socialism, into the U.S.S.R. Your Adenauer government, your great ally in defense of "Western Civilization," has a Foreign Ministry whose staff is 85 percent Nazi, and in whose Ministry of the Interior function twelve of Hitler's generals.

And does your fastidiousness extend to Franco, Professor? General Collins, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, has just left Franco's generals, the N.Y. *Times* of December 19 reports from Madrid, after conferring on how best to spend the \$125,000,000 Congress appropriated towards sustaining your fellow upholder of "Western Civilization." Any debates with the Generalissimo, or the General, these days, heroic, open-minded, truth-seeking Professor?

Talking of fastidiousness, Professor, whatever made you contribute that piece on "What Is 'Guilt by Association'?" to the November 1952 *American Mercury*? Do they pay that

well, Professor? I ask, not because of the article's theme, which was really old-hat for you. You were simply lambasting the Communists again, and such "dupes" as the American Association of University Professors and the American Civil Liberties Union and the Public Affairs Committee for having some doubts as to the decency of fastening guilt upon individuals through their past associations. This, as I say, was all part of your noble defense of Western Civilization that you have been conducting so self-sacrificially. But—the *American Mercury*? Why, the chairman of its board, as the magazine proudly announces, is Mr. Russell Maguire. Now, this Mr. Maguire, as *Time Magazine* reminded everyone recently (December 8, 1952, p. 42), made his money through oil and submachine guns and uses it, not only to pay for your articles, but to distribute anti-Semitic and fascist publications such as those of John Beaty, Merwin K. Hart and Allen A. Zoll. Indeed, Mr. Zoll has handled the *Mercury's* ads and its subscription department. The *Mercury's* editor, William Bradford Huie (did you find him a pleasant chap?) announces that he knew his boss was a Christian Fronter, but, he says, "if Adolph Hitler was alive and wanted to give a million dollars to the *American Mercury*," he'd hasten to accept it.

Mr. Maguire and Mr. Huie recognize objectivity when they see it, don't they, Professor?

You say, still in your first paragraph, that your "evidence for characterizing the Communist Party as a conspiracy, and its members as professionally unfit to fulfill the vocation of a teacher, has been published many times." That is true—you haven't wanted for publishers and you have, in this, found a lucrative profession. Communism has been damned incessantly and banned repeatedly, but it has not been refuted.

Nothing you say of Communism was not said before by Thiers, Bismarck, Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito, Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, Al Capone and other statesmen. But a lie—uttered by Hitler in 1932, does not become the truth because it is uttered by Hook in 1952.

On the contrary, it is the same Big Lie, fabricated and

spread for the same reason—to prepare the way for fascism and world war.

Communism is not a conspiracy and Communists are not conspirators. From Engels' *Principles of Communism*, written in 1847, where one reads: "Communists know only too well that all conspiracies are not only useless but even harmful," to Lenin's *Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats*, written fifty years later, where Lenin said of himself and his comrades: "They do not believe in conspiracies; they think that the period of conspiracies has long passed away" (*Selected Works*, International Publishers, 1943, Vol. I, p. 382-83), to Dimitrov's denial of the same slander at the Reichstag trial, to Dennis' denial at the first Foley Square trial, to the denial by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and her fellow-defendants today at the second Foley Square trial, Communists have always opposed conspiracy. Communism being, as the *Communist Manifesto* states, a movement of the vast majority in the interest of the vast majority, and basing itself on science, must be and is, organically and by definition, opposed to conspiracy. Within the limits of a communication this basic proposition cannot be developed fully. Had you agreed to a debate, its development would have been central to my presentation.

Here let me only add that to think of Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung as conspirators and the history-making mass movements which they led or lead as conspiracies is either lunacy, depravity or colossal ignorance. To think of a Dr. Norman Bethune, a Theodore Dreiser, a William Z. Foster, a Louis Aragon, a Pablo Neruda, a Martin Anderson Nexo, a Pablo Picasso, a Dolores Ibarruri, a Nazim Hikmet, a Julius Fuchik, a Gabriel Péri and a thousand more of the most talented, devoted and self-sacrificing leaders of humanity as conspirators also reflects, and can only reflect, lunacy, depravity or colossal ignorance.

I take this opportunity, once again, to challenge you to publicly debate this question with me at any place and time you name.

But, to return to your letter.

Still in your first paragraph, you refer, oh, so blithely and innocently, to "freedom of the press." But you were less naive and more truthful, back in 1934—those "emotional Thirties," as your fellow repentant, Irwin Shaw, so pleadingly called them. Back then, speaking at the University of Virginia, on July 4, you saw that,

"The right to manufacture anything for the market means the actual power of the owners as a class to determine what the rest of the population shall consume . . . to operate the press, movies, and radios as business enterprises; to control churches and schools. . . . (*International Conciliation*, December, 1934, no. 305, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, p. 455.)

Now, after eighteen more years of the trustification and cartelization of the newspaper business, you call the press of the U.S.—central propaganda device of the millionaire class that owns it, whose salaciousness and anti-humanistic malignity have plumbed new depths of depravity—you call this "free"!

As to your concluding remark, in the first paragraph, concerning my "own fatherland, the Soviet Union," you write this so boldly only because you know that a Communist these days has few rights enforceable in the courts. But this attempted slander, dealt out in your snide way, is like your hostility in general, a mark of honor.

We turn now to the excerpted quotations you have offered in an attempt to prove that a Communist cannot have an objective, scientific approach because he is a lost soul, in pawn to monstrous plotters, or, better, is the willing agent of such monstrous plotters.

To introduce our remarks in this regard we choose to quote Sidney Hook. Writing in the "emotional Thirties," when a volume entitled *Towards The Understanding of Karl Marx: A Revolutionary Interpretation* (John Day, N.Y., 1933) would be in tune with the times—even if, as in this case, it did not really enhance an "understanding of Karl Marx"—our author

said (p. x): "No author can guard himself from the will to misunderstand. But he can diminish the dangers of distortion by inviting the reader to follow the argument in its own terms and to judge it in the context of the views opposed."

I agree with these two sentences. Do you, now, Professor? Let us examine your offers of proof in the light of the above elementary criterion of scholarship, as well as in the light of others, equally axiomatic—such as accurate quotation, for example.

Thus, to show what horrendous creatures we Communists are you quote Lenin this way: "It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice and even—if need be—resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges. . . ." And you cite his *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 95. The words you quoted actually read, and I italicize what you carelessly omitted: "It is necessary *to withstand all this*, to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of stratagems, manoeuvres, and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges . . ." Why omit the four words, Professor? Because if they are included, the reader will ask: What does Lenin mean—"to withstand all this?" The reader will want to know what preceded these words, and what followed these words, written in 1920; the reader will want "to follow the argument in its own terms and to judge it in the context of the views opposed."

Let the reader do that and what does he find? What is it that is to be withstood? Why, the pressure of the bosses who will fight "to prevent Communists from getting into the trade unions" and will, in the course of this use "the police and the courts," and will "insult, bait and persecute them." This is what is to be withstood. And to make his point perfectly clear Lenin follows the quoted words with reference to the persecutions "under tsarism" and to the use by the tsar of "secret service agents" who sought to trap class-conscious workers and so maintain the illegality of the trade-union movement.

Oh, objective Professor, how different is the quotation when fully given and placed in its context! But then, as your young writer Hook said, "No author can guard himself from the will to misunderstand."

Again, you quote the resolutions of the Ninth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. this way: "In order to carry out their work effectively, and to win the respect and confidence of the workers, all Communists must *at all times* take a position *on every question* that is in line with the policies of the Party." It would have been helpful, if what you sought was to convey truth, had you stated that this convention was held in 1936 and that the italics were not in the original. It would have been helpful, too, and in accordance with elementary standards of scholarship (isn't it shocking that a Communist must point this out to the truth-seeking, dedicated chairman of a philosophy department in a great university?) to have really quoted the entire sentence, rather than to give the reader part of the sentence under false pretenses. The sentence reads, and again I italicize what you carelessly omitted:

"In order to carry through their work effectively, and to win the respect and confidence of the workers, all Communists must at all times take a position on every question that is in line with the policies of the Party, *which always are designed to serve the best interests of the masses.*"

A small detail, eh, Professor? And, of course, excising a part of this sentence may convey, as you meant it to convey, that soulless robots are told from on high what they will think about everything and then, by some magic or evil device, do believe that way. What vicious nonsense! The Communist Party operates democratically—a million times more democratically than the corrupt, gangster-ridden big business parties—and its line is hammered out after the most extensive and searching criticism and evaluation. And the line is tested among the people and constantly re-evaluated, with utmost freedom, as a *duty* of the membership. Of course, members remain members voluntarily and membership connotes here,

as elsewhere, basic agreement, but nothing is further from a robot, from an unthinking tool, than is a Communist.

Again, you quote William Z. Foster as writing, in 1938, in connection with professional people, that they are to be admitted into the Party if they "show by practical work that they definitely understand the Party line, are prepared to put it into effect, and especially display a thorough readiness to accept Party discipline." You add your own italics, but this is no time to become finicky over relatively picayunish violations of scholarly standards. Foster's point was that professional people, normally of well-to-do or petty-bourgeois backgrounds, might tend, more than workers, to be vacillating, anarchistic and arrogant (would you know anything about this, Professor?). That is why the words immediately following the ones you excerpted, go on to say: "It is not enough that professionals should support our general struggle for democracy and peace; they must also accept the socialist principles of our Party."

And it would have helped, too, if you had told the reader what it was that Foster wanted "put into effect." His preceding section developed that. Here is an example, coming just before your excerpt: ". . . Our doctors must be the first-line champions of an adequate government health program, our lawyers must fight for free legal aid for the masses, our teachers must still further popularize education, our actors must democratize the theatre, our writers must find ways to bring good literature and effective political writing to the masses. . . ." Pretty dangerous stuff, isn't it, Professor?

And then you quote another whole sentence from this 1938 article of William Z. Foster. "Thus, our teachers must write new school textbooks and rewrite history from the Marxist viewpoint." Horrors!—you write: "this affects you" (your eloquent italics), and then, solemnly, you add: "You are an historian." How momentous, and how pretentious!

Shall only the sons-in-law of iron magnates, like Rhodes,

and the sons of adjutant-generals, like Schouler, and millionaire dairy farmers like Beard, and editors of big business journals like Oberholtzer, and the scions of Georgia plantation owners like Phillips, write new textbooks and history books? Only the rich, white Anglo-Saxon Republicans and Democrats? Foster here is saying what Engels said: "All history must be written anew." Of course, and from the viewpoint of the working class and oppressed nationalities, of the vast majority of mankind, from the viewpoint of the masses—the only objective viewpoint there is. I am a Marxist, and an historian, and will write, to the best of my ability, in accordance with my outlook. I think this outlook is the most fruitful for historical investigation; if it isn't, let this be demonstrated—let the omissions and errors be pointed out, let the criticism be unrestrained—but honest!

In your letter you point to "sworn public testimony" to the effect that I and others, acting under the orders of the Soviet police, underook to "rewrite" American history. It is interesting to find you have such ready access to police files. The testimony you refer to was offered by an informer whose name I have forgotten (I think he was rewarded with a job at Fordham), who testified before the notorious Rapp-Coudert inquisition some twelve or thirteen years ago. His story, if your summary is correct, was a colossal prevarication. Personally, all I remember of his testimony was that when this person, whom I did not know, testified concerning me, he knew me so well that he erroneously rendered both my first and last names, calling me several times Henry Apotheker—what an imaginative alias!

What is left of your communication? A few sentences torn out of context and culled with colossal care from one article amongst thousands in the thirty-one thick volumes of a monthly magazine in existence for a generation. And this is presented as though it were Holy Script! I don't know what it is to you, but I do know what it is to me: it is sentences,

sixteen years old, excerpted by an intensely hostile selector, which are poorly conceived and badly phrased.

And then three specific assertions with which you climax your letter—each as false as the other.

You say "the Kremlin decided" that the Negro people in the United States constitute a nation. And that it then "commanded" Communists to adopt this idea which you state, with noble indignation, "would Jim Crow the American Negroes into a segregated state of their own." This entire paragraph contains more falsehoods than it does words.

The Kremlin has never ordered anyone to believe anything about the Negro people in the United States; the position of the Communist Party on the Negro question in the United States as a national question is entirely misrepresented by you, and your idea that from this position one arrives at a Jim Crow state reflects not only your colossal ignorance of this whole question, but also the crassest white chauvinism.

You should know that the clearest presentation of the Marxist-Leninist position on the Negro question in the United States yet written is *Negro Liberation* by Harry Haywood, published in 1948 by International Publishers. In that book you will find the following words:

"What, concretely, is the meaning of the right of self-determination? What should be understood by it? Is it to be identified with separation? As regards the Negroes, is it to be equated to the demand for a separate Negro state in the Black Belt—a Negro republic? [a demand, let me add, that has been raised by various Negro newspapers and leaders, at different times, for the past hundred years—H.A.] Does it run counter to the principle of Negro and white unity, so essential to the struggle for Negro rights and democracy? Is it not a capitulation to Jim Crow or segregation, as many of the critics of this principle contend? . . .

"The right of self-determination means none of these things. Quite the contrary." (p. 157)

And again, Mr. Haywood writes: "It would be scraping the very bottom of the foul pit of distortion and calumny to label this democratic need of the Negro people of the Black Belt a concession to Jim Crow or to assert that it plays into the hands of the Bilbos and Talmadges." (p. 161)

Written as though he had you in mind, is it not, Professor Hook? If you did not know this work, you should be scholar enough to be aware of your ignorance; if you did know of it, you deliberately falsified.

And from this you leap to biology and to the Michurin-Lysenko rejection of Weissmann-Morgan theories in this field. Here you quote two sentences from a Professor Zhebrak, as translated and excerpted (it is *not* printed in full, as you falsely assert) in a book authored by two well-known "friendly" inquirers into Soviet life, George S. Counts and Nucia Lodge. This is like King George III quoting Voltaire through excerpting from a translation and abstract by Edmund Burke! Is this an example of the methodology of objective scholarship that you teach in your Department?

The impression you seek to convey in this tortured excerpt is of a scholar, bound hand and foot to political vulgarians, who leaps to conform to their whim and will. Even the excerpt offered by Counts and Lodge will refute such a slander, for that does present three pages at least of scientific argumentation and self-debate. Moreover, of course, the source for this whole controversy is the 600-page book, *The Situation in Biological Science: Proceedings of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U.S.S.R.*, the complete stenographic report of the eight-day meeting held in the Summer of 1948 (published by International Publishers in 1949). Here will be found the most intense kind of public, scientific debate, culminating years of searching, open inquiry, experimentation and investigation into the entire field. And here, too, will be found our friend Professor Zhebrak, participating vigorously and at length in the proceedings (see especially pages 467-476), the result of which was an affirmation on the part of the assembled scientists of their belief that the Michurin-Lysenko theory was in accordance with scientific truth.

It was from Oregon State College that a professor of chemistry was fired a few years ago for daring to suggest, in a letter

to the editor of a professional journal, that the theories of Lysenko should be at least examined *prior* to being condemned! Where were your protests in this case, Professor?

From Lysenko you leap to Czechoslovakia and find there—via Vienna and the New York *Times*—"an official pogrom on a high level"! The reportage from Vienna on the people's democracies of eastern Europe is on a par with the reportage from Riga and Bucharest on the Soviet Union that used to adorn the pages of the *Times*, the Hearst press and other pillars of your "free press." There is no person—not to speak of a scholar—who does not know that these newspapers—that all boss-owned newspapers—have consistently carried on the most unrestrained campaign of unadulterated lies against all lands where the people take power into their own hands and become their own bosses. The lies eventually are exposed. But manufacture of lies exceeds their exposure—thanks to your "free press."

Finally, you pen this gem: "Tell us whether as an objective historian you agree with the *Daily Worker's* claim that the framed Slansky trials have no anti-Jewish aspect, whereas the Rosenbergs, charged and convicted of a most heinous crime against the United States, are being punished merely because they are Jews?"

First: most certainly the Czechoslovak trials carry no anti-Jewish aspect. In that country, unlike our own, the display of anti-Semitism is a serious crime, severely punished, and one of the charges, *in those trials*, made by the prosecution was that several of the defendants had been anti-Semitic.

Second: You are certain the trials in Czechoslovakia were "framed," but that the Rosenbergs are really guilty "of a most heinous crime." Your famous "open" mind, seems to be open only at one end! In one trial defendants charged with specific acts of treason, sabotage and murder (including turning over to the tender mercies of the Gestapo the national hero of Czechoslovakia, Julius Fuchik) confess their guilt—but you

are sure they were "framed"; in the other case the defendants, though offered their lives if they confess, refuse the offer and persist in maintaining their innocence, but you are sure they are guilty. In one case dozens of witnesses and scores of documents demonstrating the defendants' guilt are introduced, but you know they are "framed"; in the other case there is one decisive witness and his testimony, denied by both defendants, is ridiculed by scientists throughout the country as absurd, but you know those defendants are guilty. In one case no perjurious witnesses are proven to exist; in the other the prosecution itself agrees that one of its witnesses, connected with circumstantial evidence, did perjure himself, at the instigation of an agent of the F.B.I., but you know the Rosenbergs are guilty!

Third: What is the "most heinous crime" charged against the Rosenbergs? The passing of information—known and never secret—to a war-time ally. This is the *charge*—the "most heinous crime," and this is denied, and despite this, these two parents are to die—and you are satisfied!

Fourth: The *Daily Worker* has never said that the Rosenbergs were condemned "merely because they are Jews." It has said, and I say, that anti-Semitism played and plays a part in this case. Is it accidental that a jury selected in New York City to try Jewish defendants does not have a Jew sitting on it? Is it not a fact that the depraved creatures who have asked the authorities to witness the executions desire especially to see Jews burn? Is it not a fact that this Nazi-like sadism is present in connection with the unprecedented death sentence meted out in this case?

Fifth: Your paragraph conveys a finality as to guilt if one is "charged and convicted" in this country. Mooney was charged and convicted. Sacco and Vanzetti were charged and convicted. The Scottsboro Boys were charged and convicted. Read *Convicting The Innocent* by Professor E. B. Borchard (Yale University Press, 1933), a study of 65 cases of innocent people "charged and convicted" in this country. "Frame-up" is an American word.

Sixth: I have read the record in this Rosenberg case, and I have read the analysis of the record by the distinguished British barrister, D. N. Pritt, and this study convinces me that the Rosenbergs are innocent and that they are being railroaded to the chair as part of the pro-war and pro-fascist drive of the American ruling class. They are to serve, if they die, as object lessons of the terror to fall upon those who, like them, hate fascism and struggle for peace.

Have you read the record? Have you studied Pritt's analysis? Should you not—as an objective scholar—should you not do that before accepting the justice of the Rosenbergs' pending execution?

At one point you say my "own writings," especially in terms of the history of the Negro people, show a "Kremlin" control. What writings? There have been half a dozen books, about ten pamphlets and hundreds of reviews and articles in scores of newspapers and magazines. You appear to be referring to my recent work—perhaps to my *Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*. Dr. Du Bois says this is a "milestone on the path to Truth." What do you say? You say that because I am a Communist I must think in such and such a manner, and if I think in such a manner, I cannot be an objective scholar. In exactly the same way teachers are accused as Communists and fired. You say that they must violate the ethics of their profession because as Communists they must think and act in a certain way. But you distort and falsify the position and practices of Communists and on the basis of such distortion come to conclusions which you insist are inevitable.

This is the technique of "constructive treason," of "conspiracy" charges, of Smith Act frame-ups. The way to demonstrate a scholar's lack of objectivity, his failure to adhere to the canons of scholarship is to examine his *writings*, as I have done with your letter; the way to prove the evil or inefficient or tendentious teaching of a teacher—and here there are dozens

of teachers involved, with hundreds of years of experience and with thousands of former students—is to examine his or her professional *conduct*. In no case were the teachers accused, even, of being poor teachers. On the contrary, all had exemplary records. It was only on the basis of a syllogism with a false foundation that the persecution is conducted, because the purpose is not the protection of free education but rather its vitiation.

May I add that I find your "defense" of science rather strange. I say this not only because of the unscientific nature of your own communication to me, as demonstrated above, but also because of the abandonment of science which is a hallmark of present bourgeois academicians serving imperialism. These academicians have embraced either mysticism or formalism, so that a Charles Beard, in his last years, gives up causation and a Professor Bridgman, discussing the "Philosophical Implications of Physics" finds that:

"The world fades out and eludes us because it becomes meaningless. We cannot even express this in the way we would like. We cannot say that there exists a world beyond any knowledge possible to us because of the nature of knowledge. The very concept of existence becomes meaningless. It is literally true that the only way of reacting to this is to shut up" (*Bulletin*, February, 1950, III, No. 5, of American Academy of Arts and Sciences).

This is the vista of your class, Professor Hook—meaningless existence, in which prudent ones will shut up. This is your "objectivity."

Those who see and yearn for another future—a meaningful, dignified, creative and peaceful future, will not and must not shut up. Those who defend freedom will reject the persecution of Communists and radicals and progressives and those whom a McCarran-McCarthy finds distasteful. History demonstrates that the persecution of Communists is the prelude to the destruction of elementary democratic rights and to the launching of aggressive wars. All who value life itself must reject and oppose such a course.

A Neo-Confederate View of the Confederacy

DR. COULTER,* A PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF Georgia, believes that the secession movement resulted from the desire of the overwhelming majority of the Southern people. Thus, he finds that "two-thirds" of the Southerners, who owned no slaves [were] as interested in seceding and fighting the war as were the slaveholders" (p. 9); "secession came and the people celebrated" (p. 15); "there can be no doubt that in the states which seceded the movement was supported by the majority" (p. 55).

Dr. Coulter believes that the secessionists did not desire, did not plan for and did not deliberately precipitate the use of violence to achieve their ends. Thus: "It was never in their minds that they could be goaded into fighting their traducers, except on a personal basis, which they always stood ready to do as only gentlemen could do, in the duel. . . . They would secede—not engage in an unseemly brawl" (p. 18). Since the aggressive violence did not originate with the secessionists, it must have come—must it not?—from Abraham Lincoln. Therefore, writes our author, "The question which has troubled subsequent generations is whether Lincoln was the marplot and bungler or the cunning villain and provocateur; whether he stumbled into war at Sumter or whether he planned it" (p. 37).

Lincoln, bungler or villain—how generous the choice provided by Professor Coulter!

Very well, we start with a united South heroically asserting

* E. Merton Coulter, *The Confederate States of America*, Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1950, being volume 7 of *A History of the South*, edited by W. H. Stephenson and E. M. Coulter.

its right to self-determination in the face of a selfish and aggressive North—which is the view not only of the very influential Dr. Coulter but, because of the writings of Randall, Craven, Owsley, Hesselstine, *et. al.*, probably the dominant view today in professional historical circles.

Professor Coulter sees two undeniable facts that appear to conflict with his original premises and it is instructive to follow his manner of handling them. Fact number one: the leaders of this overwhelmingly popular movement made no effort—prior to the accomplishment of secession—to submit the momentous question to the people's vote. Indeed, they resisted all proposals of this nature. Fact number two: this overwhelmingly popular movement disintegrated when put to the test of a war carried to it by the invading, despised foe.

Why is it that in eight states of the Confederacy the question of secession was never submitted to a vote of the electorate? Why is it that in the three states—Virginia, Texas and Tennessee—where the question of secession was voted upon, the balloting was not done until *after* each of them had already been committed to the Confederacy, and hostilities had actually begun? And why is it that even in these three states, Tennessee split in half, the Governor of Texas (the anti-secessionist, Sam Houston) was illegally superseded, and Virginia likewise broke in two?

Coulter's answer as to why no vote was held while the question was a live one is "the mania for unanimity" (p. 31), an answer whose absurdity is self-refuting. The real answer to the questions posed above lies in the nature of the secession movement. *That movement was a counter-revolutionary coup d'état engineered by a desperate slaveocratic oligarchy against the will of the majority of Southern white people.* And that oligarchy was made desperate by the success of the northern and western coalition under the hegemony of the rising industrial bourgeoisie and the banner of the Republican Party, by the greatly intensified class consciousness and null-tant action of the Southern non-slaveholding whites, by the unprecedented extent of slave disaffection, by the frequent

appearance of white-Negro unity in the South during the pre-Civil War decade, by the maturing of the Abolitionist movement, and by the slave plantation economy's insatiable need for expansion.

The Southern counter-revolutionaries knew their cause was not popular and they said so, though Professor Coulter, understandably, does not quote them. It was ex-Congressman Aldrich of South Carolina who said of secession late in 1860:

"I do not believe the common people understand it; but whoever waited for the common people when a great movement was to be made. We must make the move and force them to follow."

It was ex-Governor Richardson of South Carolina who declared during the same period that the white people of no state was for secession with the possible exception of his own. It was Edmund Ruffin, wealthy slave-holder, and Virginia's arch-secessionist—who fired the first round at Fort Sumter (Ruffin, not Abraham Lincoln!)—who confided to his diary on April 2, 1861, that it was "communicated privately by members of each delegation [to the Confederate Constitutional Convention] that it was supposed people of every State, except South Carolina, was indisposed to the disruption of the Union—and that if the question of reconstruction of the former Union was referred to the popular vote, that there was probability of its being approved."

Only this background makes understandable fact number two—the complete disintegration of the Confederacy when put to the test of war. Professor Coulter, faced with this fact, explains it by "loss of morale," "the spirit of the people gave way" (p. 70); or, "why did the Confederacy fail? . . . The people did not will hard enough and long enough to win" (p. 566).

But, of course, Coulter's explanation simply poses the question in different words: Why was there a "loss of morale"? why did "the spirit of the people give way"? Because it was not a people's war. And here we must explicitly include the

35 percent of the South's population—the four million Negro people—who are not among Coulter's "people." To that 35 percent of the South most intensely and to the vast majority of the remaining 65 percent only somewhat less intensely, the war was not theirs, it was not just and therefore "the people did not will hard enough" to win and perpetuate the rule of the oligarchy.

Professor Coulter devotes fourteen pages to the four million Negro people (*i.e.*, less than 3 percent of his volume) and in these pages finds "happiness" and "loyalty" their characteristics, while he dismisses the Negro Union troops as nuisances who "cluttered up operations" (pp. 256-63). There is no more point dignifying this tripe with serious argument than there is in so dignifying similar mouthings on the contemporary scene from Rankin or Talmadge. Actually Professor Coulter's chauvinism incapacitates him from writing sound history, especially United States history and most especially southern United States history.

So complete, however, is the evidence of mass opposition among white people to the Confederacy that, despite the author's class bias and asserted thesis, material on this is in his book. Indeed, the only positive feature in this work is the material offered on labor strikes, anti-war activity and demonstrations (especially by women), desertion and anti-Confederate guerrilla warfare. Enough of that is here to refute Coulter's own insistence on the popular character of the Bourbon's uprising, even without the additional mass of evidence in the works of Roger Shugg, John K. Bettersworth, Ella Lonn, Georgia Lee Tatum, Albert Moore, and others.

Coulter's identification with the Bourbon has taken a tack hitherto rarely openly displayed by himself or his colleagues. I refer to anti-Semitism which was distinctly present in the semi-feudal, ultra-reactionary slave South and is distinctly present in this book. Coulter uses uncritically and repeatedly the most blatant and nauseating anti-Semitic sources, laments the "influx of Jewish traders of German and Polish origins" who "gave all Jews an evil reputation" (p. 228), and finds it

appropriate to describe the Confederate Secretary of State, Judah P. Benjamin, as "this Sephardic Jew . . . bland and suave and oleagenous like a well-fed shopkeeper" (p. 381)—written like a well-fed American Goebbels.

One may add that the reviews of this volume in the commercial and professional journals have been almost uniformly laudatory and that Professors Allan Nevins and Dumas Malone recommended it, last Christmas, as an ideal gift.

JANUARY, 1953

The Filthy Rich

IN DESCRIBING THE ETHICS OF THOSE WHOM A LESS HYPOCRITICAL age than ours agreed upon naming the Robber Barons—and who are so precisely characterized by the folk-term, "the filthy rich"—Thorstein Veblen referred to "the ceremonial canons of pecuniary decency, which are reducible to the principles of waste, futility and ferocity."

Today, Pulitzer-Prize historians, like Professor Allan Nevins, insist that the Robber Barons were really "the heroes of our material growth," and where Veblen saw waste, futility, and ferocity, the newly-crowned Dean, Louis M. Hacker, finds "boldly venturesome and socially creative" personalities. Well, now along comes Mr. Cleveland Amory, a most proper Bostonian, himself born at exclusive Nantant, to give us a five-hundred page, painfully detailed work* that he subtitles *A Portrait of American Society at Play*. And when Mr. Amory says "Society," he does not mean society, but rather the scum temporarily on top.

Reviewers of Mr. Amory's book in the commercial press have given the impression that it deals with an amusing, dead past, an idea suggested, too, by the author's "clever" title. Thus, typically, Orville Prescott, in the *New York Times*, speaks of it as "a richly entertaining book" chronicling "the decline and fall of a way of life," and doing the job—thank Heaven!—minus "social significance."

Actually, the work is by no means confined to the past, for while it does draw heavily on the last half century for its data, it includes considerable contemporary material. Indeed,

* *The Last Resorts*, published by Harpers.

Mr. Amory joyously reports that "current tax structures permit the idle rich to remain both idle and rich." And when Mr. Prescott, in relief, finds an absence of "social significance" and therefore lauds the "deft hand" of the author, what he really means is that Mr. Amory is not a hostile witness of the antics of the multi-millionaires, but on the contrary, a sympathetic one.

Mr. Amory's obvious good-will towards his subjects makes all the more devastating his disclosures of their habits and values. For example, at one point the author turns his attention to changing "society" fads in relation to gigolos. Today, he observes, the "young sport" (as he calls the species) need only be a capable dancer, dress in accordance with current styles, and be a competent cardplayer—others will meet his gambling debts. His chances of real success are good, we learn, because, writes Mr. Amory: "Society (is) primarily dominated by widows who, among other things, are always on the lookout for the possibility of making a joint return on their income tax," and therefore the young sport "has excellent opportunities of marrying for money. Beyond this, if he proves sufficiently incompatible, he has equally excellent prospects of divorcing for money."

Mr. Amory permits himself a restrained burp of indignation at only two points in his edifying chronicle. He finds, among Society, an especially intense anti-Semitism and remarks that the record in this regard "is an extraordinary one." His own attitude becomes clear, however, in the loving prose he devotes to Mr. Bernard Baruch's understanding of such "unfortunate" failings, an understanding which leads Baruch to stay away from places where he is not wanted!

He notes, too, the completely Jim-Crow character of Society. Here, however, he has nothing but approval, his volume reeking with white chauvinist "jokes." He finds that the banning of Negro residents—or visitors—from the premises of the elite, adds to their "regal impression."

And, secondly, the author unequivocally frowns upon the conduct of a particular member of the elite whose passion is

young girls and horses. This gentleman "especially enjoyed . . . taking young girls to his farm in Kentucky where, if they proved difficult, he would tie them up without their clothes and force them to witness, at close range, the breeding of his horses." For these somewhat extraordinary tastes the gentleman appears to have suffered from a mild ostracism.

Others had less violent eccentricities. Mrs. Lanier would ride a pet bull into town; Mrs. Spencer insisted on entertaining with a "smartly groomed pig" at her side; Mrs. Foster "always wore black velvet eyebrows." These were permanent modes of conduct; at parties—and one was always going to, coming from or giving a party—really interesting things happened. The Du Ponts show up as elephants, and James Hillman occasionally appears as a seal-trainer, complete with seals—i.e., his three attractive daughters, dressed in tight black satin, who, at the suggestion of their father-trainer, roll around the floor.

These, be it observed, are merely the eccentrics. Mr. Amory notes that "an extraordinary number" of the Society members go completely insane, though for one outside the charmed circle, like this writer, the nice distinction is not always readily discernible. For example, none of the above individuals are anything other than normal Society members with certain characteristic peculiarities. And every once in a while very formal dinners are given, with a formally-attired monkey as guest of honor, but none of the participants, including the honored guest, is apparently insane. And then at Newport, one hundred dogs, in fancy dress, had their own dinner—all elaborately served (by humans) at a dining table but again sanity was not in question.

Mr. Amory does find insane the behavior of an individual who, believing himself the Prince of Wales, hired, on a permanent basis, actors to impersonate Court officials, imported an expert on Court etiquette from London, regularly received "Ambassadors" (these were sane fellow-members of Society), and every day donned the uniform of varying principal regiments of a score of countries.

This Prince of Wales, Mr. Robert Garrett, had other responsibilities. He was, for instance, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Isn't it extraordinary how rugged these individuals are—running a court and a railroad at the same time! We will grant Dean Hacker's "boldly adventuresome," but his "socially creative"?!

There are, of course, more normal, hum-drum pursuits. Gambling, for instance. "Card-playing," says Mrs. Ralph Robertson (she had been Mrs. James Clews and then Mrs. George Blumenthal, but when this book went to press she was Mrs. Ralph Robertson), "saves our lives." The loss of \$200,000 in one evening, by John Studebaker, was somewhat unusual, but only somewhat. Marrying, as another instance. The name of the present Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post Close Hutton Davies is, in its length, not unusual for Society.

And there are cultural pursuits: books, as an example. A book-dealer who concentrates on the Society market, reports his customers "are not particular about content." Rather, the important thing is the color of the book-jacket and if this is approved by the interior decorator, "we can get rid of anything" at "a flat rate per shelf."

But the main recreation is pure money-spending—the Florida household of the Stoteshurys costs \$650,000 to operate per year; Mr. Merrill, the Wall Street broker, manages his Florida "cottage" at a mere \$360,000 annually.

And the main pursuit is money-making. But Mr. Amory does not go into that. That would be vulgar; it would show a lack of deftness. That would touch dangerously close to "social significance."

Yes, these are the rulers as depicted by a court-scribe. They have the morals of goats, the learning of gorillas and the ethics of—well, of what they are: racist, war-inciting, enemies of humanity, rotten to the core, parasitic, merciless—and doomed.

3. POLEMICS ON THE LIBERAL ILLUSION

The Schlesinger Fraud

DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS THE BEST PUBLICIZED AMERICAN theoretician of the self-titled non-Communist "left"—or the N.C.L., as the group is fondly called by the State Department—has been Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Winner of the Pulitzer Prize, associate professor of history at Harvard, a founder of Americans for Democratic Action, Mr. Schlesinger has also been a frequent contributor to such distinguished periodicals as *Collier's*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *New Leader*, *Partisan Review*, *Nation*, *New Republic*, *Saturday Review of Literature*, *New York Times Magazine*, and Henry Luce's *Fortune* and *Life*.

Just now there appears the essence of these numerous papers in a volume entitled *The Vital Center*.^{*} This is a good occasion to examine the methodology, argument, and program of Mr. Schlesinger, particularly in view of the fact that he epitomizes the N.C.L. intellectual.

While engaged in this enterprise I thought of Dante's description of the battle between a serpent and a man in the bowels of Hell, wherein finally the man sinks down himself a serpent and glides hissing away. For Mr. Schlesinger is terribly concerned about a being he calls a Communist. This creature, he says, is possessed by "a consuming envy," "a passion for violence," "an appetite for gangsterism." The Communist is also, this psychoanalytical expert finds, a "lonely and frustrated" person seeking among other things "sexual fulfillment" from assorted comrades. That "the personal word of the Com-

^{*} Houghton Mifflin Co. This will be the source for all quotations from Mr. Schlesinger, unless otherwise indicated.

munist is worthless" is, of course, clear, and while after all this one would have thought it superfluous, Mr. Schlesinger nevertheless makes quite explicit his conviction—which he seems to feel is very important—that "cooperation with him is impossible."

In the midst of this gentle chiding, Mr. Schlesinger pauses to scold Communists for their "vituperative" language! As for himself and his fellow N.C.L.'ers, he modestly remarks that they seek "to fight for honesty and clarity . . . to restore a serious sense of the value of facts, of the integrity of reason, of devotion to truth."

Never did Marx speak more truly than when he said that "the greater the development of antagonism between the growing forces of production and the extant social order, the more does the ideology of the ruling class become permeated with hypocrisy . . . the more does the language used by the dominant class become sublime and virtuous."

Let us begin our examination of Mr. Schlesinger's method, of his "devotion to truth," by giving a few typical examples of his use of quotations. The professor of history is writing of Lenin:

"With his call in 1902 for the professional revolutionary, he set in motion the Communist process of taking the revolution away from the people. We need, he said, a 'small compact core, consisting of reliable, experienced and hardened workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts, and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organizations of revolutionists.' This tight, disciplined elite, plotting in secrecy and mistrusting the world, impregnated Bolshevism with conspiratorial obsessions which easily survived the conquest of power in 1917. This conspiratorial paranoia has become the conditioned reflex of Communism."

Now, what did Lenin say, and in what connection, that leads Mr. Schlesinger to point to this passage as a seminal one in the paranoia characteristic of Communists? The date is indeed 1902 and the place is Czarist Russia. Lenin is dis-

cussing *not* Party activity, but trade-union activity (illegal at the time) and specifically is criticizing the cumbersome and elaborate rules for trade unions proposed by the St. Petersburg Economists. In this connection Lenin wrote:

"A small, compact core, consisting of reliable, experienced and hardened workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organizations of revolutionaries, can, with the wide support of the masses and without an elaborate organization, perform *all* the functions of a trade union organization, and perform them, moreover, in the manner Social-Democrats desire. Only in this way can we secure the *consolidation* and development of a *Social-Democratic* trade union movement, in spite of the gendarmes." ("What Is To Be Done?" in *Selected Works*, II, pp. 133-134; italics in original.)

If Schlesinger had quoted Lenin honestly, what would have become of his argument?

Again, Schlesinger "quotes" Lenin. He is intent upon boldly exposing the deccitfulness of the Bolsheviks, and so he offers this as from Lenin:

"Between 1903 and 1912, there were periods in which we were formally united with the Mensheviks . . . but we *never* ceased our ideological and political struggle against them."

When and in what connection is Lenin speaking? The time is 1920, and Lenin, in his "*Left-Wing*" *Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, is arguing against sectarianism; he is showing how the Bolsheviks united with others in particular struggles but maintained their independent position and their right to criticize. So, Lenin says:

"Between 1903 and 1912 there were periods of several years in which we were formally united with the Mensheviks in one Social-Democratic Party; but we *never* ceased our ideological and political struggle against them on the grounds that they were opportunists and vehicles of bourgeois influence among the proletariat."

Again, Schlesinger "quotes" Eugene Dennis in an effort to

prove that Communists have no honest interest in winning immediate gains for the masses. So, he writes:

"Eugene Dennis put it simply in his post-election analysis: The 'main dangers' at present, he said, 'are that Mr. Truman will make concessions on domestic social issues.' The choice of words illuminates vividly the Communist attitude toward the welfare of the common man in the United States."

Mr. Schlesinger cites as his source for this quotation the *New York Times* of November 14, 1948. When one turns to this paper one finds that the only words of Mr. Dennis directly quoted by the *Times* are "main dangers" and that the remaining "choice of words" offered by Mr. Schlesinger as Dennis' are the paraphrasing of Dennis by that non-partisan newspaper! The *Times* states: "The 'main dangers' at present, he says, are that Mr. Truman will make concessions on domestic social issues. . . ."

When we turn to what Eugene Dennis did say (as reported in full in *The Worker*, November 14, 1948, from which the *Times* says it is "quoting") we find it to be quite unlike what the *Times* sought to imply and directly contrary to what Mr. Schlesinger asserts.

"What, we may now ask [wrote Mr. Dennis], are some of the main dangers in the post-election period? For one thing, the Dewey-G.O.P. defeat undoubtedly creates some temporary illusions about Truman, the Democratic Party and the new Congress. But while the Administration may make certain maneuvers and concessions to the people . . . and may go easy on frontal attacks against the trade union movement it will proceed with the North Atlantic-Western Union war alliance and with other key aspects of the imperialist bi-partisan war program . . . the key task in advancing the cause of peace, security and democracy, is the fight for partial economic and political demands on the broadest united front basis" (italics in original).

Observe that a central feature of Schlesinger's misquotations is the calculated omission of any reference to the repeated calls for mass unity—Lenin, "with the wide support of the masses";

Dennis, "broadest united front basis." This is in line with one of Schlesinger's central motives—to prevent such unity among all progressives in the face of developing reaction, to persuade the people that, as he puts it, "cooperation with the Communists is impossible."

Occasionally Mr. Schlesinger, to vary the monotony, borrows quotations made out of whole cloth by fellow-mythologists. Thus we find Lenin saying: "Trade unionism signifies the mental enslavement of the workers to the bourgeoisie"—but this is from David Shub's *Lenin* as shoveled up by Schlesinger, and Shub's work has as much in common with Lenin as the quoted sentence has with this one: "The workers' organizations for carrying on the economic struggle should be trade union organizations; every Social-Democratic worker should, as far as possible, support and actively work inside these organizations." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, II, p. 128).

Soon Shub will be borrowing from Schlesinger, and *New Leader* or *Life* readers will learn that Lenin said: "Nothing has ever been more unsupportable for a man and a human society than freedom." True, Lenin "says" this in the course of an Orwellian fantasy spun by Mr. Schlesinger in which he concocts a three-page long conversation between Lenin and Lincoln. Here the historian at last soars freely, unrestrained even by the fetters of misquotation.

Schlesinger's mendacity takes forms more direct than that of misquotation or fantasy. Space limits us to two examples: In the course of proving the iniquitousness of Communists he says in reference to Dr. Max Yergan, that they "beat him up physically and looted his office." This is a bare-faced lie. I was and am a member of the Executive Board of the Council on African Affairs and actively participated in the successful struggle to remove Dr. Yergan from his position therein as Executive Secretary. It is true that Dr. Yergan—being unable to explain very serious financial irregularities—turned to Red-baiting. It is true that in the course of this he *accused* members of the Board of having assaulted him and looted his office, but it is also true that the police authorities—not unfriendly to

Yergan—found his story so obviously concocted that they refused even to begin proceedings on these fake charges.

Again, to prove the deviousness of the Communist Party, Mr. Schlesinger twice asserts that it opposed the enactment of the Mundt-Nixon Bill in 1948 only in order to help secure its passage, a display of pathological reasoning that I analyzed elsewhere (*Masses & Mainstream*, September, 1948).

All this our Pulitzer Prize historian offers in his noble attempt, as he puts it, "to restore a serious sense of the value of facts!"

There is another quality in Mr. Schlesinger's writing that requires brief notice, and that is his insufferable arrogance. (One is prepared for this by his touching plea for humility.) He exemplifies this by tossing aside the monumental work of the Webbs, *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization*, the finest flowering of fifty years of devotion to the social sciences, as "dreamlike." He proceeds instead on the basis of his own laborious researches in the files of Hearst's *Journal-American* to weep for the apathetic, tormented, enslaved Soviet peoples. Similarly, the opinions on the struggles in Spain of Señor Del Vayo, outstanding authority and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Spanish Republic, are dismissed as "devotional essays," while "the role of the Communists in delivering Spain to fascist tyranny" is buttressed by citations from George Orwell, associate of Trotskyites in the P.O.U.M. in Spain.

In some instances Schlesinger's arrogance becomes positively laughable. Thus, this bourgeois-begotten, -nurtured and -bound intellectual describes Karl Marx as "so characteristically a bourgeois intellectual"! Again, in "explaining" the absence of unrest and rebellion in the hell he calls the U.S.S.R., he remarks that "modern science has given the ruling class power which renders mass revolutions obsolete"—this at a time when the "modern science" of world imperialism has stood in impotent rage before the revolution of the Chinese people.

Schlesinger's *general technique* of argument is worth some attention. It consists largely of slipping the maximum number of falsifications into the minimum number of words. We offer again some typical examples.

In his introduction to a recent collection of the *Writings and Speeches of Eugene V. Debs*,* Mr. Schlesinger states: "His own career disproved his repeated assertion that capitalism would destroy political freedom." To the mind of Schlesinger the fact that Debs was a Presidential candidate while an inmate of a Federal penitentiary "proves" the existence of political freedom! We shall return to Mr. Schlesinger's concepts of freedom shortly, but here we want to point out not only the absurdity of the sentence, but its dishonesty. For reading it, one would believe that Debs had asserted—repeatedly—that capitalism "would destroy" political freedom. Debs never said anything of the sort, for Debs was a Marxian Socialist, and he understood the class character of the bourgeois state. He knew and spent much of his life trying to show the American people that where there was capitalism there *could not be* "political freedom"; rather than saying that capitalism would destroy political freedom, he said—repeatedly—that the achievement of this freedom in any real sense was possible only with the elimination of capitalism and that the struggle for this freedom was simultaneously a struggle *against* capitalism.

Returning to *The Vital Center*, we find the following paragraph: "There is even a clause in the [Communist] Party constitution forbidding 'personal or political relations with enemies of the working class.' But this does not have to be invoked often. Most Communists voluntarily renounce non-Party friendships and activities."

Here Mr. Schlesinger is trying to establish the "lonely," "frustrated," and generally abnormal character of American Communists. Notice the method: you point to the Communists' principled opposition to enemies of the working class and then equate such enemies with all non-Party people. Later, however, when he wishes to show the insidious, con-

* Hermitage Press, New York, 1948.

spiratorial character of Communists, Schlesinger dilates upon their "infiltration into mass organizations."

The facts, of course, are simple and the Party's constitution is quite explicit. It says (Art. IX, sec. 4): "Personal or political relations with enemies of the working class and nation are incompatible with membership in the Communist Party." And further (Art. IV, sec. 11): "Every Party member in a mass organization shall work to promote and strengthen the given organization and protect the interests of its members."

One more example. Schlesinger speaks again: "Police raids, F.B.I. penetration and civil persecution have fortified the Communist belief that they are a small and ill-armed band, acting in a ruthlessly hostile environment, and justified in using any methods to advance their cause." The unguarded reader might at first glance take this to be some sort of mild rebuke against the current rape of civil liberties by the Truman administration. But observe: The "raids," "penetration," and "persecution" have but "fortified" the already existing Communist "belief" that the Party members are really "justified in using any methods to advance their cause." Observe, too, the charged word, "ill-armed." Well, given the cause of Communism to be, as Schlesinger repeatedly says, chaos and tyranny, and given the existence of a belief among Communists that any methods are justified in advancing such a cause, does this not make heroes out of the raiders, penetrators, and persecutors of such an organization? Is this not ideological preparation for more Peekskills?

Before entering into a specific analysis of the ideology and program of Mr. Schlesinger, there remains another Schlesingerian tactic to be examined. Our scholar is fond of creating his own definitions to suit his particular argument. Two examples of this will be offered.

The first example concerns the term *Lumpenproletariat*, and in examining the paragraph in which Schlesinger's definition appears, the reader will observe the use to which he puts his definition.

"Marx recognized [writes Schlesinger] that many workers

were not Marxists and so invented [!] a classification called the *Lumpenproletariat* in which were dumped those who did not live up to theory. Lenin recognized this too and so invented [again!] a disciplined party which announced itself as the only true representative of the proletariat, reducing non-Communist workers to political non-existence."

Surely, even in this era of a bourgeoisie gone berserk, no more vicious nonsense has been packed in so small a space as in that last quotation. With some effort we restrict our comments to Mr. Schlesinger's newly-discovered meaning for *Lumpenproletariat* and refer him to the *Communist Manifesto*, with which the history professor must be familiar notwithstanding Harvard's well-known and understandable fear of Marx and Engels. In that *Manifesto*, Marx and Engels wrote, a century ago:

"The 'dangerous class,' the social scum (*Lumpenproletariat*), that previously rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of the bribed tool of reactionary intrigue."

A second interesting definition offered by Schlesinger is that of the term "exceptionalism." The definition comes in the midst of and as part of his futile effort to show the foreign nature of the Communist Party, and while he is lauding the "independence" of Jay Lovestone and Benjamin Gitlow. "The heresy of 'American exceptionalism,'" writes our scholar, is that which holds "that special circumstances in the United States might justify occasional deviations from the Moscow line." Now Mr. Schlesinger, the historian, must know that the most consistent and vocal opponent of "exceptionalism" within the Communist Party has been William Z. Foster, and one would think that adherence to the most elementary tenets of the historical profession would lead him to the writings of Mr. Foster. There he would not have wanted for a definition and an analysis of "exceptionalism." Thus, he would have found, for instance, Foster stating, in discussing Lovestone: "In our Party he developed his theory of 'American excep-

tionalism,' the substance of which was that capitalism in this country had become so strong and progressive that it was no longer subject to the general economic laws governing the recurring capitalist crises." (*On the Struggle Against Revisionism*, (N. Y., 1946), p. 35).

This corrupt methodology stems from its function. Arising from a decaying social order and attempting to serve as a bulwark of that order, the method fits the ideas.

Schlesinger sees himself as the ideological heir of Theodore Roosevelt (for whom he has much praise), of the Roosevelt who in anger once berated J. P. Morgan for his blatant reactionism which made it so difficult for him to preserve the Morgans. The heirs of Theodore Roosevelt face the task of preserving a capitalism forty years older and so much the more rotten.

Schlesinger makes this quite explicit. In a volume wishfully entitled *Saving American Capitalism*, he wrote: "... to reform capitalism, you must fight the capitalists tooth and nail," while the book's editor, in its preface, remarked: "... the authors in this volume have in common a disposition to save capitalism. . . . The difficulties increase as, with spreading economic chaos, the rest of the world abandons private enterprise."*

Schlesinger feels this sense of urgency very keenly. Early in his *Vital Center* he warns that

"The dynamism of capitalism is trickling out in a world where the passion for security breeds merger and monopoly . . . the capitalist system has begun to destroy the psychological interest in its own survival." And he reports that, "Our lives are empty of belief. They are lives of quiet desperation . . . in a society turned asocial."

How, then, rationalize "a disposition to save capitalism"?

There are several steps for the Schlesingers. First, one destroys the alternative—socialism—verbally, of course—by the methods we have already examined. Then one destroys the possibility of discovering any other alternative. And how is that accomplished?

* Seymour E. Harris, Ed., *Saving American Capitalism* (N. Y., 1948).

It is accomplished, basically, by building a system founded upon the idea of the inherently and hopelessly corrupt nature of Man. Schlesinger does *Masses & Mainstream* the honor of quoting it as representative of his ideological opposition. He cites the conclusion of an analysis of Auden which appeared in its June, 1948, issue:

"Let us turn from Auden's mummified existentialist man to Maxim Gorky's complete, unambiguous man, the man who has taken his side with the forces of life . . . 'the miracle-worker and the future master of all the forces of nature' . . . The City of Man will be built by those who speak with the voice of Maxim Gorky, not the whine of W. H. Auden."

Mr. Schlesinger disagrees and finds man to be "a creature of doubt and ambiguity, undone by 'the fire and treason crackling' in his blood." It is in this "nature" that he finds "the root of all evil"; it is in man's incessant and insatiable "will to power," in his aggressiveness, which "underlies all social arrangements," that he locates the trouble.* Man's native inadequacies are aggravated, Mr. Schlesinger finds, by industrialism, which requires the modern man to "organize beyond his moral and emotional means." It is "the fundamental cause of our distemper" for "in the end industrialism drives the free individual to the wall." This explains Schlesinger's nostalgia for feudalism: "The protective tissues of medievalism . . . consoled and fortified the bulk of the people"—a remark that would have interested the serfs who, despite their consolation, followed Huss, Tyler, and Muenzer.

The inherent deficiencies of man exacerbated by industrialism and its "technical necessity for organization . . . sets in motion an inevitable tendency toward oligarchy." This tendency exists "under whatever system of ownership" and "no loopholes have yet been discovered in the iron law of oligarchy."

There has been, then, an "unwarranted optimism about man," which has led to the erroneous belief that social reform

* The similarity of this view to that of Reinhold Niebuhr's "sin" is obvious.

is possible "by argument," or that "a change in economic institutions" might be relevant to efforts at liberation. And everything returns to the basic postulate: "Most men prefer to flee choice, to flee anxiety, to flee freedom."

So we have this situation: men are incurably evil and this deficiency has been made more tragic by the fact that industrialism has increased the moral and emotional demands made upon this very imperfect being. Given this nature, and seeing it as basic to society's inadequacies and injustices, the socio-economic realities of any society are largely irrelevant to man's real well-being. The tendency towards oligarchy is irresistible and the idea of progress is an "illusion." In sum, to quote a favorite phrase of Mr. Schlesinger's, "all important problems are insoluble"; and this, he insists, must be understood, for based upon this understanding comes man's salvation since "the good comes from the continuing struggle to try and solve them, not from the vain hope of their solution."

In the midst of all this, what has become of Mr. Schlesinger's "democracy" and of his devotion to "freedom"? These have become not "phrases against capitalism," which Lenin accused his era's philistines of using; no, in our era and in the United States, the philistines, these men of "hollow gut," as Heine called them, use phrases *for* capitalism. Here and now capitalists are so distraught and so desperate that they frown more and more even upon lip-service to anti-capitalist slogans.*

We find, therefore, that to Schlesinger, the present social order in America—despite "The sin of racial pride [1] which still represents the most basic challenge to the American

* The American Social-Democrats understand this very well. We will give one example, of very recent vintage. The source is the official organ of the American Social-Democratic Federation, the *New Leader*, of August 27, 1949. Here we find an article entitled "Portrait of a 'Sewer Socialist'" by Anatole Shub. The "sewer socialist" is Irving C. Freese, Socialist Mayor of Norwalk, Connecticut. "Freese calls himself a 'sewer socialist,'" gaily writes Mr. Shub, "and says he's proud of that epithet. . . . In the words of a prominent merchant, 'Freese isn't really a socialist . . . he's a sort of non-partisan.' . . . His comptroller is a Republican, his corporation counsel a Democrat." Concluding his joyous piece, Mr. Shub quotes the hero himself: "Right now, a lot of business people are supporting me and they are not ashamed of it [*They* are not ashamed!] They know it will be a long time before we take their wealth away. . . ."

conscience"—is "democracy." "The job of liberalism" is to "devote itself to the *maintenance* of individual liberties and to the democratic control of economic life. . . ." [My emphasis—H. A.] And for this "liberalism" Schlesinger finds that "class conflict is essential if freedom is to be preserved, because it is the only barrier against class domination." Observe, class struggle proves the *absence* of class domination. As a result, in the United States, "The capitalist state . . . has become an object of genuine competition among classes. . . . The function of the state, in other words, is to define the ground rules of the game. . . ." Who made the rules? Who enforces them? Who owns the ball park? Who owns the equipment? Who pays the players and umpires? To whom is the price of admission paid? What is at stake in this "game"? Do not trouble Prof. Schlesinger with such problems—he has already told you they are "insoluble."

Once in a while Mr. Schlesinger forgets himself. Thus, while building up his neutral state overlooking a social order with the greatest degree of concentration of wealth ever achieved in history,* he nevertheless will remark: "Never in American history have any administrations served the business community so faithfully—one might well say, so obsequiously—as the Republican administration of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover." And in 1946 Mr. Schlesinger said: "It looks very much as if the conservative businessmen and politicians now running the two parties have, by spontaneous and convulsive agreement, united to drive meaning out of politics." (*Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1946.) And whom did the administrations of Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, McKinley, Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson serve: the Molly Maguires, the debt-ridden farmers, the Negro people, the Haymarket martyrs, the Homestead dead, the Pullman strikers,

* This is not the place to document this remark, and so universally recognized is its truth that perhaps extended documentation is not necessary. It may be pointed out that the Federal Trade Commission in a report entitled "The Merger Movement" issued July, 1948, reported that, as of 1947, 78 manufacturing corporations had more net working capital than the total assets of ninety per cent of all manufacturing corporations. The same Commission in a report issued in August, 1949, stated that 113 corporations owned 46 per cent of the assets of all manufacturing corporations, of which there were some 55,000.

the coal miners, the steel workers, the Palmer Raid victims, the unemployed, the dead and maimed of two imperialist wars?

I think Professor Schlesinger knows the answer to these questions. I say this because his program does not envisage benevolent behavior by a nebulous and impartial "state." No, on the crucial front of civil liberties we find this vigorous remark: "The Attorney-General's list of subversive groups (whatever the merit of this type of list as a form of official procedure) provides a convenient way of checking the more obvious Communist-controlled groups. . . ." He adds to this two points: he feels that the Attorney-General was "foolish" in including the Socialist Workers Party—Trotskyists—in his list, and that he was negligent in *not* including "organizations like Progressive Citizens of America, which have a large proportion of non-Communist members but rarely, if ever, oppose Communist objectives."

The question of Negro liberation is never even posed; he devotes one page to a Myrdalian lament concerning the "sin of racial pride," and to a sneering reference as to how Communists allegedly "use" Negroes—a reference illuminating Mr. Schlesinger's own concept of the Negro people.

Fascism he finds to be a lower-middle-class movement of an indigenous nature, while Nazism was, compared with Communism, an "incomplete" totalitarianism having at any rate the virtue of being "candid."

As to foreign affairs, Mr. Schlesinger feels "the United States is assuming today more vigorously than ever before the role of international champion of political democracy." (*Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1946.) What Mr. Schlesinger's "democracy" is we have already seen, but, in the area of foreign affairs he spells it out for us quite carefully:

"Without American support no colonial empire can survive. But the abrupt end of empire may well have disastrous economic consequences for the colonizing power. *American funds might well assist in the peaceful expropriation of the imperialists, helping tide both the colonics and their former possessors over the period of economic readjustment*" (my italics—H.A.).

But, while Mr. Schlesinger sees the possibility of Great Britain peacefully getting out of Malaya and Spain out of Morocco and France out of Indo-China—with the inhabitants of these lands just lounging around, of course, while their futures are settled—he does not envisage the possibility of international peace generally. No; war, too, is a problem, an important problem, and since no important problem can be solved, war cannot be prevented. The search for peace, like the search for anything else of social importance, is doomed to failure. Perhaps this is well, for, remarks Schlesinger, "The pursuit of peace . . . easily passes into its bastard substitute, anesthesia."

And this is the voice of *The Vital Center*; this is the voice of the American "Third Force."

The meretriciousness of Schlesinger's method befits the iniquitousness of his ideology. And both methodology and ideology are fitting off-springs of Schlesinger's program—a program groomed to the needs of a ruling class seeking war and fascism.

JUNE, 1952

Civil Rights and the Liberals

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE BECOMING INCREASINGLY IMPATIENT at war scares, price hikes, Jim Crow and witchhunts. The monopolized communications do well at smothering and distorting, but when flyers won't fly and workers won't work and 250,000 Negro men and women become registered voters in Florida despite hell, high-water and Groveland, the news will out.

Here are some of the signs of stirring on the anti-witchhunt front culled only from a recent week. A priest stated in a sermon that "Every Catholic—especially the Catholic writer—should be distinguished by a love of justice and freedom and by a spirit of clarity in his writings." And the priest, Father McCullen, permitted *The Nation* (April 26, 1952) to publish the sermon in its entirety, with a preceding editorial paragraph naming the particular Catholic writer he had in mind in his criticism—the hierarchy-sponsored Louis Budenz.

In Atlanta, Georgia, fifty delegates from six Southern state organizations of the N.A.A.C.P. denounced all avowed Presidential candidates from the Republican and Democratic parties because none had "demonstrated any genuine concern for civil rights."

In Cincinnati when the 950 delegates to the biennial convention of the League of Women Voters observed that their national board had omitted reference to civil rights in its recommended program, they altered the program from the floor. A delegate from Shaker Heights, Ohio, pointed to this omission and declared "that threats to individual freedom were growing, individual rights were being restricted and

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE LIBERALS

131

character annihilation was prevalent." She called on the assembled women to "help stem the tide of our disappearing freedom" and was—said the *New York Times*, April 29—"roundly applauded."

And in Cleveland, the 2,500 delegates to the convention of the Right-led Textile Workers Union-C.I.O., adopted a resolution condemning the Smith and McCarran Acts, the convictions of the eleven national leaders of the Communist Party, calling the Supreme Court's decision upholding those convictions "a grave blow to our heritage of free speech and free thought," and labeling anti-Communism as "a cloak for reactionary forces to drive the people into patterns of conformity."

Some recent books reflect this growing popular awareness of and concern about the corrosion of our civil liberties. This essay will briefly examine and assess three influential examples of this literature. These are:

A collection of essays, edited by Clair Wilcox, Professor of Political Science at Swarthmore College, entitled *Civil Liberties under Attack*.^{*} The contributors to this volume include Henry Steele Commager, Professor of History at Columbia, Zechariah Chafee, of Harvard Law School, Walter Gellhorn of Columbia Law School and James B. Baxter III, President of Williams College.

Second, *The Loyalty of Free Men*, by Alan Barth, editorial writer for the *Washington Post*, with a long foreword by Professor Chafee, issued in mass quantities by Pocket Books at thirty-five cents.

Third, a report by the American Civil Liberties Union, *The Judges and the Judged*,^{**} by Merle Miller.

The first two volumes deal generally with the assault upon civil rights; the Miller volume examines the effect of this assault—in the form of a private racket conducted by ex-F.B.I. agents—upon the radio and television industry.

^{*} University of Pennsylvania Press.

^{**} Doubleday.

The central positive fact about all these volumes is that they do reflect—in however limited a fashion (and the limits will be analyzed)—the general, growing concern with the steady eating away of our Bill of Rights. This concern is expressed with sufficient impact to arouse furious attacks from the reactionary press—Hearst, Scripps-Howard, the *New Leader* and the others.

The authors and contributors to these volumes are appalled at the grossness of the Un-American Committee which questions a scholar like Professor Harlow Shapley behind barred doors, forcibly ejects his lawyer, denies him the right to call witnesses and has the professor's written statement torn from his hands.

They believe people should be punished for deeds, not thoughts; they find intolerable the advice of a Congressman that one join only those organizations approved by the American Legion and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; they think coercing "loyalty" is self-defeating; they believe that heterodoxy of thought is stimulating rather than subversive.

One of these writers, Professor Robert Carr—contributing to the Wilcox volume—wants a strong, national F.E.P.C., recognizes that the Negro people really desire equality and freedom, and finds a cause of war to lie in "the prejudiced, contemptuous policies followed by American states or communities toward their Negro citizens, their Oriental citizens, or their Indian citizens."

To have such views expressed in these times, by men such as these, is invaluable and tremendously heartening to all who believe that freedom need not be and will not be wholly lost in the United States.

Yet all the contributions suffer from serious limitations in analysis and errors in fact which greatly undermine their effectiveness. A critical evaluation of these works is necessary to advance the common effort of all democratic and peace-minded people.

The books appeared because of the writers' concern with finding, as the title of one reads, civil liberties under attack. Immediate questions that arise are: Under attack from whom? For what reasons? What is to be done about it? On each of these crucial questions the volumes fail the reader.

The first question—*who* is attacking civil liberties?—is hardly posed, let alone answered. Capitalism, imperialism are words which never appear in these volumes. The word "fascism" appears once in the three books. This is in Professor Chafee's foreword to Barth's book, where the reader is told "there is no need to worry much about fascism."

They say, too, that Communism is not much of a "danger." Or, at least, "internal" Communism—at the present moment. But, at the same time, their thesis is, as the cover to Mr. Barth's volume maintains, that it is "the Communist threat to freedom" which really evokes the attack upon civil liberties! That is, while none states *who* is attacking civil liberties, all assume that the responsibility for the attack rests with the Communists who have, so far, been particularly attacked!

Mr. Commager, for example, lamenting Congressional inquisitions, finds these denying the basic principle that "even the worst criminal has a right to his day in court" and concludes, "If this principle goes by the board, under pressure from Communism, then Communism has won a notable victory."

Similarly, Mr. Barth, horrified at recent glaring examples of the violation of elementary democratic rights, exclaims: "Nothing that the agents of Communism have done or can do in this country is so dangerous to the United States as what they have induced us to do to ourselves."

And Mr. Miller concludes his study of the Red-baiting victimization of radio and television performers by remarking that "*Red Channels* has surely done exactly what the Communists would wish it to do . . . [It has] created in one of this country's most crucial industries the kind of terrified dissension on which the Communist Party always has and always will grow."

All of these writers falsely picture the Soviet Union as an aggressive, reactionary power and repeat the slander that the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States—if not each of its members—are agents of this power.

It is because these authors have accepted the basic argument of those whose gross anti-democratic and indecent behavior alarms them, that they are unable to discover who is attacking civil liberties.

What, then, is their explanation for that which alarms them? "We are afraid," replies Professor Wilcox. Who are "we"? All of us. Of what are we afraid? A phantom—"our fear has no conceivable foundation in fact."

Professor Chafee feels the Second World War is to blame; it "taught us to hate each other." "We" have thus become afflicted with a "mental pestilence of hatred and fear." Elsewhere he finds, in all seriousness: "The biggest danger to the United States is from stuffed shirts—stuffed shirts in positions of authority who seek to fill every government office and every teaching position with stuffed shirts." Professor Gellhorn dismisses this particular question more briefly but with no less—and no more—illumination: We are in the midst of "the periodic hubbubs."

Well, then, civil liberties are under attack, we know not by whom, because all of "us" have the "hubbubs" induced by Communists who really are terrible, but really aren't dangerous.

What to do? Given such a diagnosis, the therapy may be imagined. It consists in prison for the Communist leaders—the "incurable" ones. For the rank-and-file, who must be certified as such not by a careless old Congressional committee but by the superbly efficient F.B.I., we can provide psychiatric treatment. Thus urges Professor Chafee. Communists, he says, are "American problem children" and "it is the task of a wise psychiatrist to reach isolated and perplexed minds and bring them into renewed communication with fellowmen"—including, no doubt, Mr. Chafee's "stuffed shirts."

This is for peace-time. But, in an emergency or in war-time, the "isolated and perplexed minds" will have to forego psychoanalysis and partake of the blunter care provided by concentration camps. Mr. Chafee adds the precaution—really superfluous, for Mr. McCarran had already thought of it—that when such measures are instituted "we ought to limit them to the emergency and be absolutely sure that they come to an end when the emergency is over." Who, among the "we," Mr. Chafee, will decide the moment of liberation—you, or Senator McCarran?

It is a measure of the corrosive power of anti-Communism that, once embraced, it leads a Professor Chafee, historian of the struggle for freedom of speech in the United States, to go along with the essential program of an arch enemy of free speech like McCarran.

And what of Mr. Miller and his investigation of the blacklist in radio and television? Has he found such repression? Yes, indeed. His book is a valuable collection of data proving the victimization of hundreds of talented artists and writers and documenting the manner whereby witchhunters have "panicked" these industries and driven from the air consideration of such "Communist questions" as academic freedom, peace and civil rights.

But what are the proposals? Basically, surrender, for Mr. Miller passively concludes that where it comes to commentators, newscasters and programs of substantive social content, "no important sponsor" would pay for views he disapproves. And that settles it! In the exalted language of Richard Rovere, in *Partisan Review*: "It is plain that among the rights of lard merchants are the right to make themselves absurd and the right to hire and fire radio performers as they please."

Having surrendered the outerworks, what about the rest of the bastion? For pure and simple entertainers, Mr. Miller thinks it would be well if the American Federation of Radio Artists policed themselves. All "accused" personnel would write a "confidential" letter of "explanation." This would be filed by A.F.R.A. and when the sponsor, through the Ameri-

can Association of Advertising Agencies, raised any question about a performer, his letter of "explanation" would be forwarded and then he might—or might not—be hired. All with a minimum of fuss.

The standards of A.A.A.A. were indicated in a recent article by one of its big wheels, Maurice B. Mitchell, "It's Still A Business," in *The Saturday Review of Literature*. Mr. Mitchell dismissed as "crackpots" those who worried about "educational talks and discussions." "Sometimes," he went on, "the broadcaster wonders whether there shouldn't be another 'freedom' added to the list of new ones we've discovered lately: freedom from culture."

It is worth noting, in passing, that our authors, having accepted the basic anti-Communist lie of the witch-hunters, take over in some instances even their techniques.

For example, Mr. Ernest Angell, chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, and Mr. Patrick Malin, its Executive Director, state in an introduction to Miller's volume that the A.C.L.U. was determined that Miller's "investigation should include the utmost possible checking on every suggestion of black-listing by Communists or other 'leftists,' and he devoted weeks of time to this effort."

In the text itself Mr. Miller says "several weeks" were given to a search for this but "not a single instance of such proof was uncovered." Which proves what? It proves, says Miller, that if there is such a list "it, like the Party itself, operates in secret," while Messrs. Angell and Malin point to the *absence* of evidence of such a list as showing "once again [!] that one of the main dangers of Communist tyranny is the secrecy in which its adherents regularly operate." Or, as Budenz put it, the absence of the advocacy of violence on the part of Communists proves how diabolically sinister is their *conspiracy* to advocate it!

Or, again, President Baxter, of Williams College, focuses his contribution to *Civil Liberties Under Attack* upon the evil

nature of Communism especially as demonstrated in its alleged violation of all tenets of scientific inquiry. To bolster his case, Mr. Baxter, a professional historian, bases a false summary of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (whose appearance he misdates), on a summary of the book appearing in a work by James B. Conant published forty-three years after Lenin's!

He tears out of context and completely distorts words written by Zhdanov as partially quoted in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, when Zhdanov's own work—*Essays on Literature, Philosophy and Music*—is readily available in English. President Baxter quotes at length from the "memoirs" of the renegade Ignazio Silone as to the "unprincipled" nature of Communists—published in the impartial *New Leader*—but never mentions and probably is unaware of the detailed exposure of Silone written in specific reply to these "memoirs," by Togliatti and available in the *London Labour Monthly* (May, 1950).

President Baxter quotes from the discussions held in the Soviet Union of Lysenko's theories, but he quotes not from the published proceedings, but rather from excerpts offered in a hostile article by Professor Sonneborn in *Science*. And Baxter's quotation, excerpting from Sonneborn, distorts Sonneborn, whose own excerpting, needless to say, completely distorted the whole essence of the 600 page volume* carrying the text of the discussions!

It is difficult to believe that President Baxter would be guilty of such violations of elementary standards of scholarly inquiry were he writing about any subject other than Communism, in which, apparently, no holds are barred.

These volumes maintain a deliberate blindness as to the source of the present assault upon civil liberties because their authors have fallen victims to the key weapon of the assaulters.

* *The Situation in Biological Science*. International, 1949, New York.

The civil liberties of the mass of American people are being attacked today by the class which hitherto has robbed the Negro people of their civil liberties. The economic masters of this country are basically responsible for the oppression of the Negro people—the greatest single example of the rape of civil liberties in this country, though the books under review do not indicate it—because much of their power and profit has been derived from this oppression.

Similarly, these economic masters control the political and ideological life of this country. It is they who are responsible for the assault upon basic democratic rights. It is they who—seeking war—find such rights increasingly irksome and would bind their home population with the chains of fascism while launching war upon the world.

Merle Miller seems surprised to discover that it is the Columbia Broadcasting System and Columbia Pictures Inc., and the multi-millionaire Chiang-supporter Kohlberg, who pay the ex-cops who make a racket out of *Red Channels*, but he need not be surprised.

Anti-Communism is the supreme racket, of the supreme racketeers—the monopoly-capitalists. It is international—Japanese, German, Italian, Spanish—and American. It is the policy embarked on by those who seek war and fascism. Its aim is to destroy all decent thought and culture—and all decent living standards.

This is why Red-baiting inevitably moves out to get all—Mrs. Bethune, president of the National Council of Negro Women and Dr. Harold Lenz, dean of students at Queens College and leader of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is no aberration; rather it is the intent of red-baiting. From Benjamin J. Davis to Mary McLeod Bethune; from the Smith Act to “regulate” thought to the Smith Bill to “regulate” trade-unions, the line is straight and clear.

Nothing except unity will break the line. The unity cannot be based on anti-Communism, main weapon of reaction. The unity must be built on anti-fascism, on a program for peace, security and equality.

Freedom-fighters are not called upon to make more “reasonable” the “excesses” of the McCarrans. Freedom-fighters must throw the McCarrans out of office. We must not “improve” the Smith Act, we must repeal it; not hope for restraint in the enforcement of loyalty oaths, but eliminate them.

“Though,” said Theodore Parker, “all the governors in the world bid us commit treason against man, and set the example, let us never submit.”

MAY, 1954

McCarthyism and the Liberals

THE OPPOSITION TO MCCARTHY IS MOUNTING. ATTACKS UPON HIM are becoming more and more numerous, and are issuing from ever new individuals and groups. The opposition is beginning, also, in some cases, to take on an added dimension; it is beginning to attack not only McCarthy, but (especially in trade-union circles) McCarthyism, as an ultra-reactionary system—as fascism.

How can the defeat of McCarthyism be accomplished? A major contribution towards answering this question has been presented by the Communist Party in its new Draft Program. This Draft Program, submitted for the widest public discussion, states that "the first task of the hour" is to smash McCarthyism and "to safeguard the democratic rights and precious liberties of the American people."

The Draft stresses that McCarthyism, American fascism, can be defeated only if it is met by the broadest unity and the sharpest clarity among the American people. In the spirit of the Draft Program, I shall examine in this essay four current books by influential authors who oppose McCarthy from what may be somewhat loosely defined as a liberal viewpoint. I propose to examine these volumes as a means of analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of this viewpoint and, it is hoped, of helping to gain clarity and forge unity in the struggle against McCarthyism.

The four volumes are: *The Urge to Persecute*, by A. Powell Davies, a nationally-known Unitarian minister in Washington; *On Education and Freedom* by Harold Taylor, President of Sarah Lawrence College; *But We Were Born*

Free by Elmer Davis, director of the Office of War Information, 1942-1945, and chief news analyst for the American Broadcasting Corporation from 1945 to the present; and *Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent* by Henry Steele Commager, professor of American History at Columbia University.*

The merits of these volumes are uneven, but their positive aspects are manifold and weighty. Present in all is a passionately expressed abhorrence for the repressive character of McCarthyism and the vulgarity, not to say, brutality, of its namesake. All the books convey a more or less complete (Mr. Davies' is the least complete, Mr. Commager's the most) dedication to the principles of the Bill of Rights.

Generally the volumes are in the humanist, rational tradition of the Enlightenment, though here, too, Mr. Davies' preoccupation with psychoanalytical jargon and with the allegedly evil nature of man give his own work a certain kinship with the "new conservatism." The four authors are nauseated with the spectacle whereby an individual desiring—to quote Mr. Davies—"to feel really safe in his job should not only conform to the most orthodox of opinions but should also adopt the most reactionary of prejudices."

Our authors defend reason, intelligence, science. Elmer Davis is appalled at a Naval Security Officer's concern upon learning that a prospective employee was a highly intelligent woman. "These intelligent people," said the luckily moronic official, "are likely to be attracted to Communism." Harold Taylor condemns the "scorn for intellectual activity" and the "dislike of science" so widespread nowadays in the college world and, in a notable passage, attacks the nihilism which holds that scientific and philosophic pursuits must be divorced from value judgment:

"The primary subject matter of each teacher lies in the values he holds. . . . The separation of knowledge into accumulation of fact and the interpretation of fact, as if they were two separate processes, makes philosophic studies empty and scientific studies barren."

* Publication data on these four volumes, respectively, are: Beacon Press; Abelard-Schuman; Bobbs-Merrill; Oxford Univ. Press.

Mr. Commager, too, in the scintillating style so characteristic of his prose, feels compelled to warn: "The greatest danger that threatens us is neither heterodox thought nor orthodox thought, but the absence of thought." Striking is the image he evokes with this sentence: "Even in American Legion halls it is probably a bust of Socrates that stands in the niche—Socrates who was condemned because he was a corruptor of youth—rather than of those forgotten members of the tribunal who put him to death."

Our authors react to the present-day desecrators of learning, the Philistines, the eager conformists, the bullies—to Senator McCarthy and the vermin he naturally assembles about himself—with the same almost instinctual contempt the late Charles Beard expressed for William Randolph Hearst, that he "would not touch him with a ten-foot pole." They detest the informer, renegade and stoolpigeon, as decent folk always have, and find especially evil the concept of guilt by association, so fundamental to the present reign of witch-hunting. On this Mr. Commager is particularly convincing and eloquent. In a truly memorable passage, he writes:

"The doctrine of guilt by association, then, is deeply immoral. It rests on a low view of human nature. It panders to spiritual pride and arrogance. It confesses a lack of faith in truth and in virtue. It dries up all our decent and generous instincts. . . . It is a device for subverting our constitutional principles and practices, for destroying our constitutional guarantees, and for corrupting our faith in ourselves and in our fellow men."

So strong is Harold Taylor's opposition to the guilt-by-association doctrine that he applies it, quite courageously for these days, even to Communists. He says: "In the end, the only test of political or moral integrity, for Communists or for anyone else, lies in the ideas, acts, and expressed opinions of the individual." And he insists that a teacher who "genuinely believes in the validity of Marxist philosophy" could be "helpful to the education of college students since it is a point of view which they seldom hear discussed."

To a limited degree—and the limits will be analyzed later—these authors see the demagogic quality of the Red-baiting technique. Elmer Davis, for instance, in a passage reflective of the thinking of others, says that the attack on the Communist Party "provides them ["many of our public men"] with a cover for attacks on liberalism and progressive reforms—attacks which might have less hope of success if they had to be made honestly . . . and, quite as important, it enables them in denouncing Communism to find the road to publicity and power."

It is certain, too, that Messrs. Davis, Taylor and Davies would agree with the definition of Americanism offered by Professor Commager: "It is a realization that America was horn of revolt, flourished on dissent, became great through experimentation." They would subscribe to these sharp words from the same pen: "We should not forget that our tradition is one of protest and revolt, and it is stultifying to celebrate the rebels of the past—Jefferson and Paine, Emerson and Thoreau—while we silence the rebels of the present."

That distinguished Americans are now writing books and that thousands of Americans are eagerly buying them (Elmer Davis' book was in its tenth printing and heading the non-fiction best-seller list at the time these words were written) are very encouraging evidences of a developing resistance to reaction.

Yet there are omissions and erroneous views, as I see things, in the arguments of the liberal authors. These failings are of great consequence because they are characteristic of the failings in major sections of the anti-McCarthy movement and serve to weaken seriously its effectiveness.

Where criticism is made—and the authors themselves insist that freedom of criticism is essential to the abandonment of error—it is made in an effort to assist in accomplishing the defeat of McCarthyism. It is necessary to make this quite explicit, for each of the four writers affirms that Communists really welcome McCarthyism, despite vigorous protestations

to the contrary. They welcome it, the story goes, because it damages the United States and because it throttles freedom and it is for these purposes that Communists exist, and so when they say they are against it they are really for it because—they *must* be for it.

That the most persistent opponents of McCarthyism and its first victims really welcome McCarthyism—that despite all the realities of day-to-day life, the Communists "must" be for McCarthy—to think in this fashion really brings one into the never-never land of unreason. And were the stakes but an abstract argument, one might be tempted to throw up one's hands, but since the stakes are democratic liberties versus fascist enslavement, human annihilation versus fruitful creativity, withdrawal from discussion is impossible. So, in the name of sanity, let this criticism, from a Communist, be evaluated in the spirit in which it is offered—constructively, openly, honestly.

We find, then, the liberal argument against McCarthyism defective for three central reasons:

First: It accepts the fundamental assumption and premise of McCarthyism.

Second: It offers no adequate explanation of the origins, nor a satisfactory analysis of the nature of McCarthyism.

Third: It offers no effective way of smashing McCarthyism, and no realistic program of its own, no inspiring bill of particulars which will answer the needs and fulfill the deep aspirations of the American people.

I

The fundamental assumption and premise of McCarthyism may be stated—not at all coincidentally—in the exact words of Hitler: "The Communist Party is a section of a political movement which has its headquarters abroad and is directed from abroad." And: "We look on Communism as a world peril for which there must be no toleration. . . . Communism is the most frightful barbarism of all times."

Such was the view of Hitler. Such is the view of McCarthy.

McCarthyism—fascism—is based on that Big Lie. McCarthyism seeks to ride into power here—as fascism did wherever it came into power—on the basis of employing that Big Lie as a club wherewith to beat into submission all who question the objective of the wielder of the club. And that objective is—as was Hitler's anti-Communism and anti-Comintern pact—fascism and world war. "To take this country through a depression and into a war," says the Draft Program of the Communist Party, "the ruling class needs fascist conformity, apathy, terrorized and submissive Americans. This is the meaning of McCarthyism."

Now, it is certain that the liberal does not agree with this analysis and he may then hold that, since it is erroneous, it is irrelevant to any effective criticism of his own ideas on McCarthyism. However, the liberal must face the fact that anti-Communism is central to McCarthyism, that McCarthy's definition of "Communism" is exactly that of Hitler's and that the liberal himself (specifically Commager, Davis, Taylor and Davies) accepts this fascist conception of "Communism" and makes it central to his thinking and his program. He thus accepts McCarthy's basic assumption (expressing difference, when he does, only as to the immediacy of the "Communist menace") and so vitiates the effectiveness of his opposition to McCarthy.

One finds in these four volumes uncritical acceptance and tiresome repetition of all the clichés against Communists—they "poison minds," "plot destruction," are "as evil as possible," are "alien conspirators," etc.

Now, this is not the place to enter into a disquisition as to the nature of Communism, except to offer (yet again—how many times since 1848!) a blanket denial as to the accuracy of the policeman's caricature and the tyrant's slander. But we would suggest certain thoughts in the hope that they may give pause to the liberal authors as to the wisdom of their present position on this question:

1) When reading the above red-baiting clichés, words written more than half a century ago take on sudden freshness:

"As I write, I take up the first book on Communism which lies at my hand, and, opening it, find Communists spoken of as 'a hideous fraternity of conspirators.' I turn over a few pages and read this: 'Today there is not in our language, a more hateful word than Communism.' Of a sentence uttered by a Socialist, this writer says, 'more pestilent words were never spoken.' . . . Such words do more than excite the anger of Socialists. They arouse the indignation of every lover of fair play. . . ."

Such was the observation* of the late Professor Richard T. Ely, to whose "notable scholarly contributions" Mr. Com-mager paid deserved tribute in his *The American Mind*. If such ignorant diatribes aroused indignation fifty years ago, might they not provoke disgust—rather than imitation—today?

2) The authors equate McCarthyism with deceitfulness and ignorance and yet find McCarthyism is truthful and informed as to Communism. Is this not remarkable? Would your reply be merely that a deceitful person may need not always lie, and so finding McCarthyism truthful in this particular is not a telling contradiction? But it is; it is because this caricature of Communism—this Hitlerian fabrication—is *central* to the whole deceit known as McCarthyism—or Hitlerism.

We are not here asking a liar for the time of day and expressing amazement that one believes him. No, McCarthy might tell you the right time; but McCarthyism is not the trade-name of a time-piece. It is the name of an ultra-reaction-ary, a fascist, political movement whose main stock-in-trade is anti-Communism and whose picture of "Communism" is false from beginning to end.

This is the heart in McCarthyism's deceit. Therefore, accepting McCarthy's version of Communism and of Socialism and his view of that third of the world which is Socialist is to accept the heart of McCarthyism and to make effective refutation of it impossible. One need not accept the Communist's position to battle McCarthyism effectively; but one cannot accept McCarthy's position and fight McCarthyism effectively.

* It occurs in Ely's *French and German Socialism in Modern Times* (Harper, N. Y., 1903), p. 16.

3) An extension of this last thought is applicable to the liberal author's handling of the informer and stoolpigeon. He hates them, distrusts them—and yet builds much of his analysis and program upon their testimony. And he deals with this testimony in a double-standard manner that violates all canons of scholarship.

Thus, Elmer Davis notes the "discrepancies in testimony" characteristic of the performance by Budenz, Bentley and Kornfeder. He finds them possessed of "inventive imaginations" and "self-refreshing recollections." Similarly, Harold Taylor comments on the manifest dishonesty of the professional "anti-Communist" witnesses, and says that he knows their testimony is false so far as it pertains to American colleges.

Both men comment adversely on their technique of excerpting paragraphs or sentences from books, articles, or letters and attempting to extract from such bleeding phrases the desired meaning, inference or suggestion. Davis is appalled, too, at the fact that in one document two sentences separated in the original by eleven pages were put together and that in another instance a man was accused on the basis of a single line torn from a letter written fifteen years ago.

Such vile practices arouse the indignation and scorn of our authors, and they treat such testimony with the contempt it deserves—when that testimony is offered against non-Communists. But when it is offered against Communists, when it is offered against the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism, then it is to be believed, then it is not only to be believed, but is sufficient to send men and women to prison for years!

The same witnesses, for the same fees, do the same things, and worse—lines excerpted out of writings not fifteen years old, but a hundred and fifteen years old, passages misquoted, others ground up, chopped up and otherwise massacred, words uttered in Tiflis in 1905 used to send Steve Nelson to jail for twenty years in Pittsburgh fifty years later—but all this miraculously is to be believed and approved, or at least condoned, because now the liars are talking of Communists and of

Marxism-Leninism.* And all this quite aside from the greater crime—jailing people not for what they did, nor even for what they allegedly plotted to do, nor even for what they said, but rather for having allegedly conspired to advocate something sometime that then would challenge the stability of the American Government!

4) Our authors, accepting the McCarthyite version of Communism, also accept the whole “duped fellow-travelers” concoction. That is, they denounce the “unscrupulous tactics” of Communists who “perfidiously announce worthy aims” in order “to serve their own conspiratorial ends” or who “distorted the policies of progressive movements with the intention of bringing discredit upon them” (the quotations are from Taylor and Davis).

So, the fair means of the Communists are used to gain foul ends (as testified to by informers who lie about everything else in the world except this) and therefore one is to fight shy of any association with the Communists (even though guilt by association is abominable) so as not to strengthen them in their nefarious purposes. But how, then, shall guilt remain personal? How, then, shall we apply Mr. Taylor’s own admirable test, “the only test of political and moral integrity,” *i.e.*, “the ideas, acts, and expressed opinions of the individual”? How, then, shall we ever rid ourselves of absolute dependence on the testimony of hired informers, provocateurs and stool-pigeons, who alone, in their magical way, can swear to the real intentions of noble-acting villains? Are none but J. Edgar Hoover, the Honorable Joseph R. McCarthy and Professor Louis Budenz immune to becoming dupes? Had we all then not better act upon the advice of Congressman Martin Dies: “Never participate in anything in the future without consulting the American Legion or the local Chamber of Commerce”?

* For a documented expose of the character of these informers and some insights into the fantastic nature of their testimony (on which Smith Act convictions are based) see the anonymous articles, “The Trouble with Informers” in *The Nation*, April 8, 15, 1950, and especially Frank Donner’s “The Informer” in *The Nation*, April 10, 1954.

Further: our authors find the government’s witnesses detestable and their methods abominable (at least when employed against non-Communists) but here they insist that foul means are meant to serve fair ends. Their concern is to tidy up the means the better to serve the ends, but is it not extraordinary that they find no difficulty in believing that fair means are serving foul ends, and foul means are serving fair ends, and all this at the same time and in the same place?

Is it not more logical to believe that he who uses foul means—fascist means—seeks a foul end—seeks fascism? Is the logical quality of this not enhanced by the devastation to science and reason and culture which the foul means have already produced as attested to by our authors themselves?

Shall we, on fundamentals, unite with Joe McCarthy, Elizabeth Dilling and George Schuyler, and approve of the jailing of William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Benjamin J. Davis? Is this how we shall preserve culture and the Bill of Rights and peace, which we are sure our authors really do want to preserve?

There is another final area of analysis in which the liberal authors fall into agreement with the McCarthyite approach, and this also tends to weaken the effectiveness of their rejection of that approach. This is in accepting the reality of what Mussolini’s Foreign Minister first called “totalitarianism.” That is, our authors accept the demagogic, Hearstian concept, “Red Fascism,” and find Communism and Fascism alike in their “totalitarianism.”

This appears most clearly in Commager’s and Taylor’s expressed adherence to pragmatism whose special virtue, in their view, is its open quality, its experimental, tentative nature and its rejection of the idea of objective truth. To Commager and Taylor it is the *search* for truth (itself indefinable) which is freedom, and he who announces he has found it, and feels it is definable, announces thereby the loss of his soul, the relinquishment of freedom.

Fascism and Communism are, then, we are told, alike basically for they are closed; they insist on having found

truth; they are, therefore, "totalitarian." It is rejection of finality, rejection of the idea of *knowing* the truth, rather than seeking it; it is the elasticity and experimentalism that come with this which, Commager says, is at the heart of the finest American tradition, is the essence of true radicalism. Therefore, the Communist is not within the mainstream of *American* rebels and fighters for freedom but rather is akin to the fascists.

This, objectively, waters down the liberals' concern for the McCarthyite "anti-Communism" program and restricts their vigorous opposition to it.

I think this view is wrong. Communism does not hold that it has found the Truth. It does hold to the objective reality of truth, to which knowledge, as it is accumulated, affords closer and closer approximations. Communism does hold, also, to the truthfulness of certain very significant observations and conclusions and fights hard to vindicate them and to have them prevail.

But is this contrary to the finest traditions of our country? Is this contrary to American radicalism? Does not our revolutionary birth certificate begin with "self-evident truths"?

Mr. Commager evokes the spirit of Jefferson and Paine and Garrison and Thoreau (why not Douglass and Debs?). Did they not hold certain things true and others false? Were they not vigorous and forthright and militant in the expression of these views? Did they not struggle to vindicate them and do we not — does not Mr. Commager — honor them not only for the selflessness and energy they displayed but also because of the lasting truthfulness of the causes they espoused — of equality, fraternity, liberty? Can we not decide, in terms of truth and falsehood, between Garrison's opposition to slavery and Calhoun's defense of slavery?

Mr. Commager, in arguing against what he views as closed systems, points to the fatal error of the slave South in forbidding criticism of its system. But was *that the fatal error*? No—slavery was the fatal error, and it was that system which required the banning of criticism, the curbing of everyone's

freedom. Is this not the *truth* of the matter? It is the content, not the form which is decisive.

Actually, Mr. Commager himself suggests this in a significant slip. He writes that it "is no accident that the nations dedicated to freedom" emerged victorious in the late great war and "those committed to totalitarianism went under." See the impossible results even so astute an historian arrives at when he starts with an obscurantist and unreal premise. He is arguing the "totalitarian" nature of the U.S.S.R. in one place and in another—when it comes to life, to actual history he places the U.S.S.R. where he must place it, with "the nations dedicated to freedom." For of course a Commager would not deny that the Soviet Union played some small part in the defeat of the Fascist Axis.

The glaring contradiction is resolved by facing the fact that it is, indeed, no accident that the Land of Socialism and the lands of bourgeois democracy could unite and did unite to smash Fascist regimes. Exactly. And in the past, here inside our own country, those dedicated to Socialism and those not so dedicated, but devoted, at least, to the Bill of Rights and to decency in human relationships, could unite and did unite to bring forth the best that the New Deal period bestowed upon our country—exactly McCarthy's "years of treason." What has been done domestically and in foreign affairs, in the recent past, can be done, in both arenas, again, now and here. We, the Communist and the liberal can—and for the sake of our country, must—unite against the fascist foe, in his current guise of McCarthyism.

II

In January, 1946, Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party and presently a Smith-Act prisoner in Atlanta Penitentiary, declared: "History has established that anti-Communism, if it is not combated and overcome in time, can ravage and destroy the most powerful of modern nations." Here is indicated the point, which history certainly has estab-

lished, that the tactic of anti-Communism is resorted to as a means of introducing fascism—of ravaging and destroying a nation.

This is McCarthyism's origin and function. McCarthyism is the creation of America's giant monopolists just as Hitlerism was the creation of Germany's giant monopolists. The racism, obscurantism, expansionism, sabre-rattling and anti-Communism of the one is identical with the other because these are the characteristics of fascism, and McCarthyism is American fascism.

Our liberal authors disagree with this analysis, but they offer little alternative for one who is anxious to understand McCarthyism—how it came into being, the source of its strength and the quality of the thing—the better to be able to combat it.

As to this, what do our authors tell us? Mr. Davis' explanation is a quip: "I do not think he [McCarthy] is a fascist; I do not even think he is a Communist . . . he is a McCarthyist." Mr. Commager does not find it necessary to consider the question; he describes some of the manifestations of a momentarily and inexplicably dominant wave of reaction and asserts his antagonism to the manifestations. Mr. Taylor thinks the phenomenon represents overzealous reaction to an overseas threat, but is puzzled and distressed that in opposing what he takes to be tyrannical aggressiveness, "the world continues to find us confused, disintegrated, uncertain, and reactionary" and even more puzzled and distressed to be forced to conclude that "the world" is just about right.

Concerning this explanation—"Communist aggression"—I would simply say, in this place, that the danger of "Communist aggression" was a hoax—the essence of the Big Lie—when Hitler cited it to justify *his* aggression; it is a hoax now when Wall Street's government cites it to justify *its* multitudinous air and naval bases, and its military forces in every country of the "free world."

Not knowing what McCarthyism is, nor whence it comes, the liberal authors are in effect compelled to ascribe its

"excesses" to Mr. Davies' "urge to persecute" or, with Professor Robert Macfver, to throw up their hands and say the "excesses" simply exist—"for whatever purposes" (*N.Y. Times Magazine*, April 12, 1953).

Not knowing the cause of malaria prevents an effective anti-malaria campaign; not knowing the cause of McCarthyism prevents an effective anti-McCarthy campaign. True, the uninformed in the first case may know how to treat the disease's symptoms and all must and should join them in this; but he who knows the source of the infection must point it out and must urge not only the treatment of the symptoms, but also an attack upon the parasites and their breeding grounds from whence the disease comes.

III

Our four authors lament the existence of the McCarthyite terror but, telling us little of its origin and nature, they offer very little as to how to overcome it and how to smash McCarthyism. The regrets are healthy and noble, but we want freedom and peace and security, not regrets. And to get freedom, peace and security, McCarthyism must be smashed.

Mr. Commager evokes, to a somewhat limited extent, the democratic and humanist features of the American past and bids us to hold fast to these values. Messrs. Davis and Davies urge reasonableness in pursuit of an effective anti-Communist policy at home and abroad which, as we have tried to show, is, no matter what the motives, like choosing a stiletto rather than a bludgeon with which to slaughter liberty. Mr. Taylor does speak of the negative and self-defeating character of an exclusively anti-Soviet orientation, but withdraws the effectiveness of this point by confessing the reality of "Soviet aggression" and affirming that this explains the militarization programs of Truman and Eisenhower, programs which were and are, therefore, "necessary."

It must, then, be said that the question of how to crush McCarthyism is hardly posed, let alone answered.

Added to this, and related to it, is the very unreal picture of America today which our authors present. They say not a word about unemployment and speed-up and mounting "recession," nor about slums and mounting prices. They say not a word about trusts and the intensively increasing monopolistic character of the American economy. They say almost nothing (Mr. Taylor is an exception here) concerning the abomination of Jim Crow. They say nothing of the laws and rulings and impending bills attacking trade unions. They say nothing as to the repeal of the Smith and McCarran Acts, the disbanding of the committees of inquisition, the release of political prisoners. They say not nearly enough as to the physical needs of the American people in terms of education and health and social security. And concerning the actual horror of war today, the danger of war, the militarization of our society (here, again, Mr. Taylor is a partial exception) there is practically nothing in the thousand pages of these four volumes.

Yet it is through these living issues, in which the American people are vitally interested, that the smashing of McCarthyism can be accomplished. It is to avoid coming to grips with these life-and-death problems, it is to exacerbate them, that McCarthyism focuses upon a mythical "Communist conspiracy." The jailing of every Communist—and of every liberal—will most certainly not eliminate one out of the five millions today unemployed. On the contrary, such jailing and policies logically leading to such jailings are contrived for the purpose, among other things, of making impossible struggle against unemployment and by the unemployed.

It is most certainly of the greatest consequence when the liberal, or anyone else, speaks out, in any form and to any degree, against McCarthy and his ism. Let increasing numbers join our four authors in any manner they will or can at this time.

But let increasing numbers see, too, that it is by resisting each and every encroachment of McCarthyism—whether from the Senator personally or from Dulles, Brownell or McCarran

—that the fascist and war danger will be repelled. Let increasing numbers see, too, that it is by *struggle* on living, specific issues with which the people—especially the great mass of people in the labor movement and in the trade unions, in the Negro organizations, in the farmers' associations—are directly concerned, that McCarthyism will be beaten. And let increasing numbers see that insisting on our differences as reasons for disunity helps only McCarthy. We must expend our energies in united struggle against McCarthyism, not in bitter fratricidal warfare.

Walt Whitman wrote: "I say there can be no safety for these states without free tongues and ears willing to hear the tongues." All who agree with this must unite under its banner and insist that the honest issues of the day, the real problems of the American people, their earnest aspirations, be placed on the political agenda: Peace, Freedom, Equality, Security.

Is Freedom an Illusion?

A RECENT NEW YORKER CARTOON SHOWED A WELL-SET-UP LADY suburbanite in a bookshop asking the clerk desperately: "Don't you have any wholesome books by healthy authors?" Clearly, *that* bookshop did not.

The cartoon expressed the sense of impatience and distaste that hesets many everyday people in the face of the vulgar and foul cultural fare set all about them. It is a part of a deeper feeling of discontent, of frantic uncertainty, of irksome impotence before what appear to be overwhelming forces concerning which one knows nothing except that somehow they are evil.

Joseph Wood Krutch's new volume, *Measure of Man** is, in part, a reflection of this and, also, an effort to come to grips with it. He, too, is distraught by the "unhappy desperate, defeatist" literature coming from "most modern writers"—by which he means most modern American writers. He is repelled by the characteristic comment of Andre Gide, mentor of so many of those modern writers: "I prefer that you should look upon health as a deficiency of disease."

His work also expresses disagreement with those who would resolve the question of good and bad by equating mores with morals, by viewing the good simply as the prevalent—by, in fact, denying the existence of the question. This places Krutch in opposition to the view that conformity is ideal behavior, and that value judgments are harmful or, at least, irrelevant to scientific inquiry.

* Joseph Wood Krutch, *The Measure of Man*, Bobbs-Merrill.

Krutch is opposed to the idea that man is a helpless creature of natural and historical circumstances, a prisoner of forces beyond his control, and that therefore freedom itself is an illusory and self-deluding concept. He does not completely deny—as increasing numbers of bourgeois thinkers do—the validity of scientific laws, of the concept of causation, but he pleads for a residuum—if it be only ever so minute—of what he calls free will. He asks no more than, as one chapter is entitled, "The Minimal Man"—"sometimes and to some degree capable of independent choices."

Mr. Krutch's volume, then, attempts to offer an alternative to the two views prevalent in American bourgeois ideology today: man as an automaton in a mechanically predestined world, or—and this is presently dominant—man as an accident in a chaotic world. Both of these, of course, make mankind inconsequential, if not contemptible. The mounting menace of fascism accounts for their prevalence at the same time as they themselves serve to prepare the way for and to justify fascism.

Insofar as Krutch's volume does represent an alternative, it reflects the humanism — restricted though it was — of classical liberalism. But insofar as Krutch makes concessions to one or the other of the alternatives (and we shall examine these weaknesses) he reflects the decline of liberalism with the change in that bourgeoisie which created it from a competitive, releasing, progressive class to a monopolistic, confining, reactionary one. Mr. Krutch's cry for "the minimal man" who is "sometimes and to some degree capable of independent choices" is the cry of the petty-bourgeois feeling himself caught between decaying imperialism and rising socialism, and seeking somehow to retain his own self-respect while basically tied in his patterns of thought to the dying system.

Krutch's book is idealist and non-dialectical, so that in it he is constantly postulating ideas that are not derived from reality and juxtaposing alternatives which are really parts of

an interpenetrating process. He conjures up, as one example, an "autonomous individual," though there never has been in all recorded history and there is not now such a person. And he believes that human conduct may be "determined either by society or the autonomous individual," when, in fact, not only is the autonomous individual his own figment, but his posing *either* society *or* the individual tears each away from the other. This falsifies both, since any real individual exists within society and any real society is made up of individuals who have definite relationships one to the other and to their social order.

All this fuzziness and unreality appear early in the volume when the author poses its central problem.

"We have engineered ourselves into a position where, for the first time in history, it has become possible for man to destroy his whole species. May we not at the same time have philosophized ourselves into a position where we are no longer able to manage successfully our mental and spiritual lives?"

But who are "we"? Surely, "we" did not will anything like that; and surely "we" do not desire to destroy mankind. Well, though "we" did not desire anything like destruction, yet it seems to impend. Surely, then, "we" can do nothing about all this.

There is, however, a "we" and a "they." There are capitalists and workers, exploiter and exploited, despite the fact that they nowhere appear in Mr. Krutch's volume. The labors of creative humanity have multiplied mankind's power a billion-fold, but the exploiters of mankind—"they"—will not release this power and it is they who, rather than release their grip upon it, would "destroy the whole species."

Knowing this, one does not stand impotent before Krutch's "we." Then one sees that while "it has become possible for man to destroy his whole species," it has also, for the first time in history, become possible for man to liberate his whole species and, so liberated and so empowered, to create a universal social order worthy of humanity. Then one makes a

choice—and the greater the knowledge, the more meaningful, the more free, and the more necessary is the choice. Then one has a program of action and participates in it, consciously and willingly and therefore freely, not "sometimes and to some degree" but all the time and to the utmost degree.

The major part of Krutch's polemics is directed against those who conceive of man as a robot caught in an inflexible web of omnipotent "circumstances." To bolster his opposition to this view he turns to the writings of certain leading bourgeois physical scientists who "warn the philosopher that no *intelligible* interpretation of the workings of nature is to be expected" (Jeans); or that "we should no longer talk of the universe" (Bushkovitch); or that "we have reached the limit of the vision of the great pioneers of science, the vision, namely, that we live in a sympathetic world, in that it is comprehensible to our minds" (Bridgman).

From this Krutch triumphantly concludes:

"The unpredictable and the indeterminate are part of ultimate reality. . . . The ultimate fact about the universe is not that everything in it obeys a law but that the random, or at least the unpredictable, is always present and effective."

First, it is to be remarked that the conclusions quoted by Krutch are not—as he would lead the reader to believe—uncontradicted. The whole fraternity of scientists in the socialist part of the world, now containing a billion people (perhaps a number large enough not to be ignored?) denies the views Krutch accepts.* It is, moreover, true that in the capitalist world, Einstein (of some consequence, perhaps, when discussing recent developments in the natural sciences?) does not hold with the conclusions of Bridgman, and that increasing numbers of younger scientists give evidences of rebelling against such stultifying concepts.**

* See: "Philosophical Problems of Quantum Physics," by A. Suddaby and M. Cornforth, in *The Marxist Quarterly* (London), July, 1954.

** For example, see: "Totalitarian and Fragmentarian: A Rejoinder," by Hans Freistadt, in *Bulletin of the American Assn. of University Professors*, Summer, 1953.

But, for our purposes, it is more important to observe what use Krutch makes of the views of Bridgman, *et al.* He makes the unpredictable and the random the key to restoring freedom. Here, he finds, is the robot's liberation, at any rate "sometimes and to some degree."

The random, however, is the mystical, not the free. This is why, as Krutch himself states, this "new view" of Messrs. Bridgman, Jeans, *et al.* "turns out to be, in at least one respect, more like the medieval than it is like that which immediately preceded it." So: "The whole universe has again become a paradox"; "We have become mystagogues again"; "Demons of one kind or another have again become, as in the Middle Ages they were, indispensable in all kinds of science."

And all in the name of freedom!

Demons will not free us, and mystagogues are not free. An ideological alliance with medievalism accompanies monopoly capitalism's political alliance with feudal forces in many parts of the world.

The unpredictable, the random, the indeterminate are the negation of science, and mean fear and impotence, not freedom and competence. The latter result is seen by the very scientists Krutch brings forward. Thus he quoted Bridgman, as we have seen, saying that "we have reached the limit of the vision of the great pioneers of science," but he did not quote Bridgman's conclusion from this observation.

Bridgman, in his address on the "Philosophical Implications of Physics," from whence the quoted words came, had drawn these "implications":*

"The world fades out and eludes us because it becomes meaningless. We cannot even express this in the way we would like. We cannot say that there exists a world beyond any knowledge possible to us because of the nature of knowledge. The very concept of existence becomes meaningless. It is literally true that the only way of reacting to this is to shut up."

Surely, this is not freedom, and it is not science. It is what follows from dependence upon demons.

* Published in: *Bulletin, American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, February, 1950.

It is noteworthy that Mr. Krutch quotes extensively from all the protagonists of the ideas he is combatting with the exception of one—dialectical materialism. No Marxist is quoted though Marxism is excoriated—or better, caricatured, and the caricature denounced.

He says that Marxists insist that one must "sacrifice anachronistic scruples concerning individual rights, the sense of fair play and the essential evil of violence"; that Marxists "do not believe that freedom is real"; that to them "free discussion, the secret ballot, etc., are mere fetishes." He writes of the "helpless creature implied by Marx"; that to Marxists "resolutions and efforts are mere illusions" precisely because, in Marxism, man is a "helpless creature."

It must be said for Mr. Krutch that, unlike many present-day "experts" on Marxism (both policemen and civilians), he does not mis-quote nor does he tear quotations from their context. He simply makes no attempt to quote; he asserts. But surely there is a Marxist literature; and a system which sacrifices scruples, denies freedom, finds mankind helpless, etc., would somewhere express the ideas and then these expressions might be quoted!

The fact is that Marxism answers the questions raised by Mr. Krutch. Marxism stands fast to science and to reason and to freedom; it denies that existence is meaningless, and that man is powerless. Marxism affirms the reality of natural and social laws.

And it is Marxism which was born in the call to struggle and which has developed in the midst of practice and effort. "Philosophers," wrote Marx, in 1845, "have interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

To change it means to understand it, and to understand it to the point of accurate prediction—ultimate triumph of science. To understand it means to want to know how to change it. Free will does not need and does not depend upon chance or accident or the unpredictable. On the contrary, wrote Engels, freedom of the will "means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with real knowledge of the subject."

It is clear, therefore, that "the *freer* a man's judgment is in relation to a definite question, with so much the greater *necessity* is the content of this judgment determined."

It is exactly the mechanical features of vulgar materialism, especially its denial of the impact of human activity upon history, against which Marx and Engels particularly argued. This doctrine "forgets," Marx wrote, in his *Theses on Feuerbach*, "that circumstances are changed precisely by men and that the educator must himself be educated." It was the dialectical concept that explained this inter-related process: "The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can only be conceived and rationally understood as revolutionizing practice."

"The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves," said the rules of the First International, written by Marx—to whom, states Krutch, man was a "helpless creature."

And this emancipation, this Socialism, this iron regime peopled by helpless creatures devoid of scruples and without freedom, how is it depicted by Engels?

"The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which hitherto have ruled man, now come under the dominion and control of man, who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of nature, because he has now become master of his own social organization."

There is the heart of it. "Confidence in the creative capacities of the masses," wrote Stalin, "is the peculiar feature of Lenin's work." It is not for promulgating ideas of men as helpless creatures, it is not for denying freedom, that Fuchik and Thaelmann and Peri were executed; it is not for denying freedom that Dennis is imprisoned. It is because Marxism knows that humanity can be really free, exploitation can be eliminated, oppression can be abolished, and because it creates a program of day-to-day action leading to this consummation, that it has been banned repeatedly and damned incessantly. But it has not been refuted and will not be denied.

As I have tried to show, portions of Mr. Krutch's book

reflect a healthy unease in the face of the mounting repression and deepening decay. But uneasiness with these aspects of the present is self-defeating if it leads to a retreat to the past, to mystagoguery and demons and the inexplicable—to the middle ages. It was then, as Thomas Paine wrote in his *Rights of Man*, that, "Reason was considered as rebellion; and the slavery of fear had made men afraid to think." Those who ruled then with demon and club were routed; they will be routed again, and this time forever, by the courage, persistence, unity of those who defend reason.

4. POLEMICS ON POLICIES OF REACTION

Reading Between the Lies: The Anti-Soviet Experts

"I CHOKED WITH RAGE WHEN I RECALL ALL THE STUPID ASSERTIONS made during the last years. We fell for our own propaganda. Now we are staggering. . . ." Thus did Nazi Army Lieutenant Kurt F. Brandes write in his diary, July 1, 1943, while at the Eastern front. Three months later he was killed.

What was the Nazis' "own propaganda"? In the United States, to cite but a typical reflection, it took the form of articles like George E. Sokolsky's "When Moscow Falls" which appeared in the *New York Sun* two weeks after Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Sokolsky rejoiced: "There need be no excuses and no explanations except that incompetence, despotism, lack of managerial capacity, lack of initiative, government by fear and purge, left the giant helpless and incapacitated. Troops will rebel against Stalin and they will, of course, have the assistance of Germany."

The master, Trotsky himself, had asserted in the *American Mercury* of 1937, that in the next war "the defeat of the Soviet Union would be inevitable." Why? Because, "In a technical, economic and military sense, imperialism is incomparably more strong." Not only was defeat inevitable back in 1937 and not only did Moscow fall in July, 1941, but Prof. James Burnham (not then, as today, adviser to the State Department) in his *The Managerial Revolution*, published in 1941, found "inevitable" the destruction and parceling-out of the Soviet Union by Germany and Japan. As a matter of fact, the distinguished scholar declared that this division "has already begun."

With such a picture of the Soviet Union—a picture flowing

from and necessary to the bourgeoisie—it is not surprising, as Malcolm Cowley reported in the *New Republic*, June 14, 1943, that when the U.S.S.R. was attacked “many of the Trotskyites in this country thought that Stalin would be afraid to arm the people or that, if he did, they would turn the arms against him.” Similarly, in his column of March 6, 1941, Walter Lippmann announced that the Nazis would find the Soviet Union “easy to conquer and well worth conquering.”

So, in all good faith and in full confidence, Hitler's Foreign Minister wrote to Mussolini's Foreign Minister immediately after the June, 1941, attack: “The Russia of Stalin will be erased from the map within eight weeks.” And the British Chiefs of Staff informed their government that the Nazi effort would “take from six to eight weeks,” while Secretary of War Stimson, in summarizing the opinion of the American military leadership, informed President Roosevelt that “Germany will be thoroughly occupied in beating Russia for a minimum of one month and a possible maximum of three months.”

And while the American people did not then see these official estimates they were reflected with absolute unanimity in the commercial press: Fletcher Pratt—“It will take a miracle bigger than any since biblical times to save Russia from a quick and complete defeat”; Hanson Baldwin—“It seems probable that Hitler will be able to achieve his main military objectives within a few weeks”; Martin Dies—“Hitler will be in control of Russia within thirty days.”

The days became weeks, the weeks months and the months years, and, apparently, the greatest miracle since biblical times *was* happening. The state which would not dare arm its citizens had put rifles into the hands of scores of millions of men, women and children. The subjects of “government by fear” responded to a life-and-death threat with unparalleled determination, calmness and courage. The government characterized by incompetence, lack of managerial capacity and lack of initiative, was being defended successfully by its armed

forces, by its aroused citizenry, by its colossal industry against the combined weight of a ruthlessly coordinated economy drawing upon 250,000,000 people and spearheaded by 300 divisions drawn from all Europe, from Spain to Finland. Meanwhile, this “inefficient managerial state” maintained sufficient strength in Asia to neutralize and tie down the bulk of the Japanese Army! And then, miracle of miracles, this government, this people and this army began not only to contain the fascist assault but to repel it and then put it to rout!

The bulk of the American people responded with amazed joy, reflected, for example, in the editorial entitled “The Russian Revelation,” in the *Boston Herald* of September 7, 1941:

“How strange it seems! A nation which was thought to be the most backward, careless, least efficient and least patriotic in the world has checked a mighty host from the nation which has been assumed to be the most advanced in organization, morale, leadership and efficiency. . . . Americans are forced to revise their beliefs as to the physical prowess of the Soviets, the skill of the leaders, the morale of the civilian populace, the willingness of all, women as well as men, to make tremendous sacrifices in order to turn back the invaders.”

Of course this was a “revelation.” For twenty-five years the rich of the world—and not least of the United States—had deliberately and incessantly lied about the first socialist state. They had several times physically assaulted it, but, above all, they had always vilified it.

When, in 1918, the United States through the Creel Propaganda Committee officially endorsed the so-called Sisson documents and announced, “The present Bolsheviki Government is not a Russian Government at all but a German Government acting solely in the interests of Germany and betraying the Russian people as it betrays Russia's natural allies, for the benefit of the Imperial Government alone,” the American people as a whole did not know and could not know that the documents were such transparent forgeries that even the

French and British governments had rejected them! When the American people heard their "liberal" President Wilson state in 1919 that the Bolsheviks were "about to brand the men under arms for them, so that they will forever be marked as their servants and slaves" it was difficult for them to believe that this erstwhile scholar was deliberately deceiving them.

The New York Times reported on November 1, 1919, that the Bolsheviks were "ravening beasts of prey, a large part of them actual criminals, all of them mad" and thereafter for months that Lenin was dying, dead, wounded, insane, fleeing and resigning and that the Soviet regime had disintegrated, dissolved, disbanded, collapsed. Two months later Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz (the latter is today editor of the New York Times) published in the *New Republic* an analysis of the Russian reportage of the Times. Here were their conclusions:

"The Russian lie is the father of lies. For lie, damned lie, it has been. It was a lie that the people of Russia were calling for military intervention. It was a lie that they believed in Kolchak and Denikin. It was a lie that they did not prefer the Soviet government to anything offered them by the Allied generals and the monarchist cliques. . . .

"And because these lies were the base of a policy of lawless invasion, disgraceful intrigue, bloodshed, devastation and famine, they have had to be established by every device known to panic and credulity."

So it continued to the Second World War. Characteristic was the handling by the American press of the treason trials of the late 1930's. As the American Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Mr. Joseph Davies—himself a lawyer and present at the trials—confidentially informed the State Department "the members of the diplomatic corps in Moscow, with one exception, were convinced that the treason proceedings clearly established the existence of a political plot to overthrow the government." And at the same time, Mr. Davies wrote, "In discussing the trial [with a fellow diplomat] he said that the defendants were undoubtedly guilty; that all of us who attended the trial had practically agreed on that; *that the outside world, from the*

press reports, however, seemed to think that the trial was a put-up job . . . that while he knew it was not, it was probably just as well that the outside world should think so."

But it was not until the end of 1941 that the State Department permitted Mr. Davies to publish this in his *Mission To Moscow*.

That which had provoked amazement—the incontrovertible fact of the U.S.S.R.'s successful resistance to the full onslaught of European fascism—also induced revisions of opinions and made possible, for a very brief period, the presentation to the majority of the American people of some truths concerning the Soviet Union.

Two typical early examples of revised opinions may be offered. W. Averill Harriman, head of the American mission to the Soviet Union, in commenting on the strength and efficiency of the population, told an American radio audience, October 12, 1941, that "We discovered that a lot of popular notions about these Russians were wrong." A former technical specialist with the United States government, Kenneth E. Davis, put the matter more fully in *Current History* for September, 1951:

"From our revised analysis, it would appear that Stalin, far from selling out the democracies, has striven to keep them from selling out themselves. Far from forsaking the basic principles of the Soviet state, he has advanced them by strengthening the anti-fascist forces of the world. It is entirely possible that when the final history of this great world crisis is written, Stalin will stand out as the man who saved the civilized world in spite of itself through one of the most profoundly brilliant pieces of strategy that has ever been employed by a national leader during an international conflict."

And on Stalin personally, the Nazi-like lies of the W. H. Chamberlins received heavy blows for a time. On the basis of personal contact and observation, Secretary of State Cordell Hull informed Congress in 1943 that he had "found in Mar-

shal Stalin a remarkable personality, one of the great statesmen and leaders of this age," while Ambassador Davies put the whole matter quite neatly by writing: "If you can picture a personality that is exactly opposite to what the most rabid anti-Stalinist anywhere could conceive, then you might picture this man."*

Professional reporters who had been in the U.S.S.R. for several months or years produced volume after volume from 1941 through 1944 of what they had themselves seen and heard and felt. These books, too, coming from publishers like Knopf, Harpers, Houghton Mifflin, etc., contradicted the fables, date-lined Riga, Bucharest and Helsinki, of the past. The authors of some of these books were James E. Brown, Erskine Caldwell, Wallace Carroll, Henry C. Cassidy, Walter Duranty, Walter Graehner, Maurice Hindus, Ralph Ingersoll, Larry Lesueur, Ralph Parker, Quentin Reynolds and Alexander Werth.

The weight of their testimony was impressive for while generally the commentary was not profound but rather impressionistic, it was first-hand and based on prolonged observation. Typically, moreover, the reporters confessed to having been themselves victims of anti-Soviet propaganda and while several showed distinct remnants of such influence the net impression of their works contradicted such propaganda.

Fairly representative was Quentin Reynolds' *Only The Stars Are Neutral*, published in 1942. Mr. Reynolds, after several months residence in the Soviet Union as a *Collier's* correspondent, wrote:

"The longer I stayed in Russia, the more I realized the terrific misconceptions we in America and Britain hold in regard to the Soviet Union. . . . I mentally apologized as a Catholic for the things I've thought about Russia's attitude toward religion. I began to wonder while I was in Moscow about the many Senate investigations into Soviet propaganda we have had in Washington these past few years and the thought struck me that perhaps the time and money expended upon those investigations might perhaps

* In his journal for May, 1945, Harry Hopkins declared that President Roosevelt "frequently spoke of the respect and admiration he had for Marshal Stalin"—Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins* (Bantam ed., 1950), II, p. 537.

have better been spent in the investigation of anti-Soviet propaganda in our country."

Meanwhile analytical works appeared assessing the experiences of the war as these bore on the U.S.S.R. Thus, Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles confessed that official Washington in 1941 had been terribly misinformed about Russia. And, in his *The Time For Decision* (1944) he found, "The achievements represented by the victorious struggle of the Soviet Union during the past two years have never been excelled by any other nation. They would not have been possible save through the efforts of a united and selflessly patriotic people." Similarly, Professor Foster Rhea Dulles of Ohio State University thought it perfectly clear in his *The Road To Teheran* (1944) that "The Russian people had shown themselves singleheartedly united behind Communist leadership in heroic, self-sacrificing defense of their homeland . . . here was striking proof that many of the ideas about the Soviet Union popularly held in this country had been founded on a total misconception of what was actually happening in Russia and of the sentiments of the Russian people."

Simultaneously the War Department was showing to about eight million soldiers the stirring and sympathetic film, *Battle For Russia*, and issuing, two copies per company, the pamphlet *Our Russian Ally*. The pamphlet, coming in January, 1945, some eighteen months after the film, contained much anti-Soviet material but its general orientation suited its title. In this work, prepared by a board of the American Historical Association in consultation with the Foreign Policy Association and distributed through official channels by the Army, one learned that Russia was not "mysterious" but that most Americans did not have the facts about this land. The pamphlet referred to the "cultural independence for national and racial groups" and the "political and economic unity among them" achieved in the U.S.S.R. Some idea was conveyed of the phenomenal industrial advances of the country and American youth learned that "Today the younger generation [in the Soviet Union] is relatively free of the hatreds and prejudices accu-

mulated during centuries of one form of absolutism or another. Every young man and woman feels that, if he or she is bright and hard-working, undreamed-of opportunities for achievement lie ahead. This feeling of confidence has done much to create enthusiasm on the part of the younger generation."

Meanwhile there came the most moving words of friendship, understanding and even devotion from the pens of Senators, Generals and the President of the United States.

Thus, it was to mark the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Red Army that General MacArthur cabled to Moscow, February 23, 1942, that "the hopes of civilization rest upon the worthy banners of the courageous Red Army." Senator James E. Murray of Montana chose to say in the pages of *New Masses* on June 27, 1944: "The Russian people have always distinguished themselves by their lofty humanism. The great Russian writers—Tolstoy, Gorky, Lenin, and the many others—were always heard in defense of the persecuted and have always fought for the brotherhood of man. Since gaining their freedom in 1917 they have toiled to translate into reality the dreams of those great minds of their country."

At the ruins of Stalingrad in 1943, Mr. Joseph Davies, as the personal representative of President Roosevelt, spoke briefly in a simple ceremony: "*Here in immortal Stalingrad . . . I lay this simple wreath of Russian spring flowers on the grave of the unknown Soviet soldier. Even in death he is gloriously typifying the supreme heroism and devotion to freedom of our unconquerable ally, the Soviet Union, its great leaders, its glorious Red Army and its heroically undaunted Soviet people.*"

No wonder that in these days a militant young trade-union leader, Mr. Joseph Curran of the National Maritime Union, remarked in *New Masses* on November 9, 1943, that "The decades of anti-Soviet smears in America are only now beginning to be slowly refuted." And as late as October, 1945, other trade-union leaders had some interesting things to say about Soviet Russia. During that month eleven representatives of the

C.I.O., headed by James B. Carey and including Albert J. Fitzgerald, Reid Robinson, Lee Pressman, John Abt, John Green, Allan S. Haywood, Emil Rieve, visited several cities and factories in the U.S.S.R. They went with the particular object of learning, as Philip Murray stated in his introduction to their printed report, "the truth about the Soviet trade union movement."

The report was submitted by Mr. Carey and carried no dissenting voice. Mr. Carey, speaking for the delegation, said they had "been deeply moved by the personal warmth and friendship" shown to them by the Soviet workers. He emphasized that no American could himself see the Soviet Union and its peoples without being "moved by the same feeling of deep human sympathy which we have felt and by the same desire to assist and co-operate in the great tasks in which the Soviet people are now engaged."

The delegation, said Mr. Carey, was especially impressed by the manner in which "the Soviet trade unions . . . promoted the interests of the workers" and by the "many activities of a social welfare and cultural character and the comprehensive nature of the social security system which they operate."

What we have seen for ourselves, said Mr. Carey, has "increased our pride in being associated with such a great trade-union movement through the World Federation of Trade Unions."

At the meetings held for the delegates by their Soviet brothers, the Russian workers were told by the Americans—and all this is duly printed in the *Report*: "We must break down the propaganda that you have no democracy at home"; or, again, "We've seen the price you have paid to establish freedom for all peoples of the world. We in America are determined that no force within or without is ever going to turn us against your people again."

And in the visitors' book at the Museum of the Heroic Defense of Leningrad are the following words:

"To the Heroic People of Leningrad: We hail your great feats that have surpassed anything in history. What you

have accomplished to defend the freedom of the people of your land and the civilization of the world, will remain in the memory of the workers forever. On to victory together, with peace and prosperity.—James B. Carey for the C.I.O. delegation."

The same man, less than five years later, was announcing that in the next war he would join the fascists against the Communists. Did "the Heroic People of Leningrad" change or did Mr. Carey change?

Mr. Joseph Curran was quite correct—in 1943—when he told readers of *New Masses* that "The decades of anti-Soviet smears in America are only now beginning to be slowly refuted." It is clear that the words needing emphasis in this remark are "beginning" and "slowly." For notwithstanding the evidence presented above of an unquestionable improvement in the reportage on the Soviet Union during, and as part of, the great war against fascism, the fact is that the improvement was partial, and of very brief duration. The further fact is that while sectors of the apparatus of communication improved, other and very important ones did not, but rather maintained a uniformly bitter anti-Soviet viewpoint.

It is not to be forgotten that Prime Minister Churchill in the very speech of June 22, 1941, announcing in effect that whatever Hitler had hoped, his attack on the Soviet Union would not bring England's withdrawal from the war, made a point of declaring: "The Nazi regime is indistinguishable from the worst features of communism. . . . No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have for the last twenty-five years, I will unsay no words that I've spoken about it."

At about the same time America's sour counter-part of Churchill, Herbert Hoover, said that Russia's being attacked made any description of a war against Hitler as a fight for freedom "a gargantuan jest," while Senator Taft felt Hitler's defeat by the Soviet Union "would be far more dangerous to the United States" than the destruction of Nazism. And the

New York *Times* of June 24, 1941, was careful to place on its first page the news that one Senator Truman from Missouri felt the United States should help "whatever side seemed to be losing. If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany and that way let them kill as many as possible." It would appear that the liberator of Korea has possessed a tender heart for many years! One may add that this early bi-partisanship of Hoover, Taft and Truman already reflected an identification with the *Wall Street Journal* which, in August, 1941, declared that for the United States to offer any assistance to the invaded Soviet Union would be "to fly in the face of morals"—morals, of course, being that *Journal's* central concern.

Indeed the warmest passion of the appeasers—hatred of the Soviet Union—burned as fiercely in what passes for their hearts after the United States became an ally of the Soviet Union as it had before. And, of course, the appeasers of yesterday are the war-provocateurs of today, because they favored fascism then as now.* The most widely-circulated newspapers—the Hearst, McCormick, Patterson, Gannett, Scripps-Howard chains—and magazines like the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Readers' Digest*, plus their Social-Democratic and Trotskyist extensions like the *New Leader*, *American Mercury* and the *Jewish Daily Forward*—kept up an incessant Soviet-hating campaign equal to and frequently quoted by the Nazi press.

It is the owners and hirelings of these organs that President Roosevelt's closest co-worker, Harry Hopkins, had in mind when he stated in his journal in August, 1945, less than six months before he died: "There are plenty of people in America who would have been perfectly willing to see our armies go right on through Germany and fight with Russia after Germany was defeated. They represented nobody but themselves and no government worth its salt in control of our country

* John Gunther puts this well: "It is interesting that the most ferocious isolationists vis-a-vis Germany and Japan in 1940 and 1941 are, by and large, the most ferocious interventionists today, begging the United States to attack the Soviet Union. The resultant implication is hard to resist that they were fascist sympathizers then, and something close to fascist now"—*Roosevelt in Retrospect*, Harper, 1950, p. 820-21.

would ever permit that group to influence our official actions."

It is perhaps needless to remark that *this group is today's government.*

The reactionary interests reflected propagandistically in the last mentioned publications were reflected also, of course, in the actual conduct of the war. From November, 1941, through January, 1942, less than half the American war equipment promised the U.S.S.R. was delivered and it took the personal intercession of the President late in March, 1942, to lift strange barriers. As a dozen books have documented, there was a deliberate two-year delay in opening the second-front. The pro-fascists courted Vichy, bolstered the Fascists, Darlan and Peyrouton, blessed Franco, maintained diplomatic relations with Mannerheim's Finland till June 30, 1944, maintained King Victor Emmanuel in power in Italy after September, 1943, propped up King George in Greece and King Peter in Yugoslavia, encouraged Otto of Hapsburg, welcomed the fascist Smetona of Lithuania. . . .

And some things were not made public. It was not then known, for example, as Andrew Rothstein has recently demonstrated,* "that Mr. Churchill had already, in October, 1942, circulated a memorandum as Prime Minister, advocating the formation of a United States of Europe after the war—including Spain and Turkey—to prevent the 'measureless disaster if Russian barbarism overlaid the culture and independence of the ancient States of Europe,' i.e., to act as an anti-Soviet bloc."

As Soviet arms indicated eventual victory toward the end of 1942, and, especially, early in 1943 with the Stalingrad victory, anti-Soviet propaganda gained a new lease of life.

The American correspondent of the London *Daily Mail* on March 20, 1943, reported an altered atmosphere. He stated that while Roosevelt still showed no desire to acquire "bases right and left" others in Washington did. He noted that many in high places suddenly were ready "on the slightest provoca-

* *A History of the U.S.S.R.* (Pelican Books, London, 1950), p. 355.

tion" to abuse the Soviet Union. "While there is a vast admiration among the great mass of people for the Red Army," he concluded, "the men of money and power still seem suspicious, even hostile, to the Soviet."

This hostility became so open—for example, David Dubinsky expressed the ardent wish, in the *Jewish Daily Forward* of May 3, 1943, that the Soviet Union might be "shot to pieces"—that it evoked sharply rehuiking editorials. These editorials appeared because the labor movement, mass organizations, a potent Left, the New Deal political alliance and the war's progressive nature cried out against the Soviet-baiters. They make fascinating reading today.

The New York *Herald Tribune* said on February 11, 1943: "There are hut two choices hefore the democracies now. One is to cooperate with Russia in rebuilding the world—as there is an excellent chance of doing, if we believe in the strength of our own principles and prove it by applying them. The other is to get involved in intrigues with all the reactionary and anti-democratic forces in Europe, the only result of which will be to alienate the Kremlin." Three days later the New York *Times* noted a developing crescendo of anti-Soviet reports "in private conversations, in the press, over the radio and in Congress." These, said the *Times*, "carry the danger that they will provide a fertile ground for the latest Nazi propaganda with which Hitler hopes to escape the consequences of defeat—the propaganda which raises the bogey of a Bolshevik domination of Europe in an effort to scare the world, divide the United Nations and therewith pave the way for a compromise peace."

Freda Kirchwey warned in the *Nation* on February 27, 1943, that "A return to pre-war power politics, built on a system of reactionary states held together by American food and Allied arms, would confirm Russia's old fears—fears which Allied foreign policy has done little to dispel." A month later, writing in the *New Republic*, George Soule declared that a continuance of anti-Soviet maneuvering would lead to a postwar effort "to build up a new 'cordon sanitaire' of anti-Bolshevist states,

and may even, after the dissolution of the Nazis, connive at the erection of a newly powerful Germany as an essential element in the balance of power, a nation in which the old military caste will have a chance to resume its accustomed role."

As a natural concomitant of the increasing boldness of reaction and the openness with which it projected an anti-Soviet policy came a distinct rise in home-brewed Red-baiting. The mass magazines and newspapers and many public officials, towards the close of 1942, adopted this line with vigor. By 1943, the savants, Professors John L. Childs and George S. Counts, published, through John Day, a "high level" condensation of the Goebbels-Hearst line under the title *America, Russia and the Communist Party in the Post-War World*. Here was projected the inevitability of war between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and the propriety of treating the Communist Party at home as a conspiratorial, foreign-dominated clique.

In this period very effective replies came to such really seditious propaganda from most respectable sources and these likewise make rewarding reading today. One example must suffice. The Associated Press correspondent in Moscow, Wallace Carroll, in his book, *We're In This With Russia* published by Houghton Mifflin in 1942, wrote:

"American Communists, or their equivalent, would exist even if there were no Comintern and no Soviet Government. They will undoubtedly go on working for communism with the devotion and persistence which are the characteristic of communists in all countries. American communists, however, are not a Soviet-American affair. They are Americans with all the rights and duties of Americans. . . . The Czarist police hounded the communists more ruthlessly and perhaps more efficiently than the American police will ever be able to do. They beat them, tortured them, exiled them, shot them, and still the Bolsheviks won."

But, as the *Nation* warned in discussing "Russia After the War" on April 3, 1943, many of the rich insisted on the in-

evitability of a Third World War—a "thought entertained by powerful forces in the United States which fear any modification of property relationships and are made uneasy by the possible existence of a powerful and successful collectivist state in the world." Harry Hopkins, it will be remembered, commented privately in August, 1945, that this group wanted "to see our armies go right on through Germany and fight with Russia." This immediately reflected itself in the publication of and generally favorable reception accorded to the books of two Soviet deserters, Barmine's *One Who Survived* and Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom*, while the Book-of-the-Month Club, in 1945, chose to distribute Aldanov's *Fifth Seal*, a fictionalized version of Trotskyism. And in a coast-to-coast broadcast the Hon. Clare Booth Luce, on May 29, 1945, put life into the burned-out tongue of Goebbels by talking of communism as "murder" and "slavery" and of the "heartbreaking pity" it was to contemplate the "enslaved Russian people" whom it was our duty to liberate!

Thus, when Leo Gruliow, American Representative for Russian War Relief for two years, returned to the United States late in 1945, the first words from an American businessman that he heard were: "So you've been to Russia! Well, tell me, we going to have to fight them?" And Mr. Gruliow was shocked for while the Russians had asked him many questions—"How do Americans live? Why do you have lynchings"—"they hadn't asked that one."*

Preparations being considered sufficient, Winston Churchill himself was carried to Fulton, Missouri, in March, 1946. During the war, as we have seen, Mr. Churchill had boasted of his consistent anti-communism, but he had not referred to his equally consistent pro-fascism. On January 20, 1927, for example, the organizer of anti-Soviet intervention had remarked in Rome:

"I could not help being charmed by Signor Mussolini's gentle and simple bearing. . . . Your movement has rendered

* "It's Strange To Be Home," by Leo Gruliow in the *Antioch Review*, Summer, 1947.

a service to the whole world. . . . Italy has shown that there is a way of fighting the subversive forces which can rally the masses of people, to value and wish to defend the honor and stability of civilized society. She has provided the necessary antidote to the Russian poison. *Hereafter no great nation will go unprovided with an ultimate means of protection against the cancerous growth of Bolshevism.*"

So, Mr. Churchill, in officially launching the cold war at Fulton, Missouri, knew well what he was doing, as did the applauding President, who less than five years before had projected the policy of "killing as many as possible."

Today one picks up his morning paper and reads of the oppressed minorities of the U.S.S.R. groaning for liberation. Now, a prize-winning psychologist, Dr. Gustave M. Gilbert, urges that "we take our cue from Goering and get the truth to the Russian people" (*N.Y. Times*, September 6, 1950). Now, again, professors insist that the Soviet leaders are suffering from "delusions of persecution that occur in the paranoic psychotic" (Dr. R. K. White, *N.Y. Times*, September 6, 1950). Now, again, "the best military minds believe Russia is a second-class power with a third-class army," according to John M. Hancock, former U.S. representative on the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission.

Organs of the rich will play rich men's tunes. Where is the labor union whose activities were honestly reported in the boss press? Where is the oppressed nationality that has been written about with dignity and respect in the boss press? What then would be the boss press' treatment of a land where workers rule and where chauvinism is a high crime?

While Clare Booth Luce and Winston Churchill were beating the war drums, Ilya Ehrenburg was writing in May, 1945: ". . . if the dream of the Golden Age should ever come true, it will be because the soldiers of liberty marched thousands of miles to plant the banner of freedom, brotherhood and light in the city of darkness. . . . Shoulder to shoulder with us fought our gallant Allies, and fidelity triumphed over

perfidy. . . . A new era has begun, an era of plowmen and masons, doctors and architects, of gardeners and school-teachers, of printers and poets."

Which shall it be? Shall an American officer enter in his diary: "I choke with rage when I recall all the stupid assertions made during the last years. We fell for our own propaganda. Now we are staggering . . ." as did the Nazi seven years ago? Or shall we defy the new Hitlers, shall we struggle against them and shall we and our children march "shoulder to shoulder" to the "Golden Age" of peace and creative labor?

"Old Friends" of China

MR. ACHESON INSISTS THAT ALL THE UNITED STATES WANTS IN Asia is to help its peoples: "We do not want to take anything from them for ourselves." And for China he has nothing but "friendship," a friendship proven by "fifty years of history." Senator Connally, with the sweep natural to a Texas plantation-owner, insists that the United States "has always been the friend" of China. Mr. Austin falls in between the Acheson-Connally school of Chinese-American historiography. He finds that the United States government has an unbroken record of friendship for China dating back to—precisely—1844 when the Treaty of Wanghai was signed. From then to now, Mr. Austin says the record has been intact, with such notable signposts of goodwill along the way as the Open Door Policy of 1899, the Root-Takahira agreement of 1908 and the fact that "all during the thirties the United States continued to manifest the gravest concern over Japanese aggression against China. . . ."

One can well understand the excitement created, then, by the remarks of General Wu Hsiu-chuan when he appeared before the U.N. Security Council, despite the vigorous—but friendly—opposition of the United States. Speaking on behalf of the People's Republic of China—unrecognized, in a friendly way, by the United States—General Wu said that, "notwithstanding the fact that the peoples of the United States and China have always maintained friendly relations, the American imperialists have always, in their relations with China, been the cunning aggressor. . . . However shamelessly the American imperialists claim to be friends of the Chinese

people, the historical record which distinguishes friend from foe cannot be altered." And even of the sacred "Open Door" General Wu declared that "though ostensibly different from the policies of the other imperialist powers, [it] was in fact an aggressive policy aimed at sharing the spoils with other imperialists."

What a scandal! And after all we had done for "those people" too! The *N.Y. Times*, in reporting the speech, was so shocked that it dropped its well-advertised objectivity under the headline: "Wu Renounces Long American Friendship." The next day the *Times* editorially wondered "what does communism do to men that they lose all sense of truth and every trace of human feeling?" It found intolerable General Wu's statement that "the American people [were] 'always the enemies of China'." Of all lies in history, said the *Times*, "this falsification of American-Chinese relations is the biggest, most shameless and most stupid" and displays a "brazen contempt for truth, for humanity, for history, and for the judgment of mankind."

The *Times*, in its excitement, apparently forgot that it had printed General Wu's speech. The Chinese official had not said that the peoples of the United States and China were enemies. On the contrary, he said, "the peoples of the United States and China have always maintained friendly relations." He did say, "the American imperialists" were the enemies of China. The virtuous *Times* was itself lying in order to accuse another of "contempt for truth."

Let us see what the record of Chinese-American relations tells us about the past. Perhaps this will illuminate the present.

A resume of the United States Government's official interest in China begins simultaneously with modern "Western civilization's" first friendly intercession there. This original display of disinterested assistance goes by the name of the Opium War, waged by Great Britain against China in 1842. When the Chinese government attempted to prevent British mer-

chants from illegally importing opium from India into China, the English navy put its misguided friends in their place with some well-aimed shot and shell. Thereupon, China was relieved of Hong Kong, and of twenty-one million dollars and agreed to certain suggested port and tariff regulations. By coincidence an American naval squadron, under Commodore Kearny, was in Chinese waters at the time and suggested to China that whatever privileges were extended to English merchants should be extended to those from the United States, too. This moved an American missionary, one Dr. Nevius, then in China, to remark: "Justifiable or not, the Opium War was made use of in God's providence to inaugurate a new era in our relations with this vast empire."*

The United States continued its role in Asia of jackal to the maturing British lion for half a century. Commodore Kearny's demand was officially repeated in 1844 by a Massachusetts merchant-politician, Caleb Cushing, first U.S. resident commissioner in China. President Tyler, in his instructions, had told Mr. Cushing that he was a peaceful seeker of trade, but remarked: "Finally, you will signify, in decided terms and positive manner, that the government of the United States would find it impossible to remain on terms of friendship and regard for the Emperor, if greater privileges or commercial facilities should be allowed to the subjects of any other government than should be granted to the citizens of the United States."

This "decided" and "positive" display of friendship resulted in the Treaty of Wanghai. This assured American merchants the same treatment granted "the people of any other nation" (i.e., of England) and forbade China from altering its tariff except "in consultation with consuls . . . of the United States." Moreover, here was introduced into modern history the principle of extra-territoriality, whereby U.S. citizens guilty of any crimes in China were *not* to be tried under Chinese law, but were "to be tried and punished only by the [U.S.] Consul."

* One may find this episode described with refreshing candor in *American Diplomacy in the Orient* (N. Y., 1908) by John W. Foster, John Foster Dulles' grandfather!

Mr. Cushing, in reporting his triumph to Washington, commented: "I recognize the debt of gratitude which the United States and all other nations owe to England, for what she has accomplished in China. . . . But in return [this treaty] confers a great benefit on the commerce of the British empire." It was left for Mr. Austin, one hundred and six years later, to tell the United Nations what a friendly and generous gesture toward China the Treaty of Wanghai was!

The next twenty years in Chinese history are dominated by the great, democratic, anti-feudal, peasant revolt, known as the Taiping Uprising (in which 20,000,000 Chinese lost their lives) and by French and British wars of intervention and robbery. American merchants assisted in anti-Taiping expeditions and, indeed, one of them, Frederick Townsend Ward of Salem, Massachusetts, commanded a force for repressing the "bandits." American naval vessels aided British and French fleets in the bombarding of Chinese forts (a monument in the Brooklyn Navy Yard celebrates one such attack of 1856) and U.S. forces actually took over a "concession" in Tientsin which was relinquished later on the direct orders of President Lincoln.*

The suppression of the Taiping democrats coincided with the opening of the Chinese forced-labor trade. Many of the rebels were in this way exiled from China. Most of the 500,000 Chinese workers carried to the United States, Latin America and the West Indies from the late fifties to the early eighties came in American vessels under conditions approximating the African slave trade for brutality. Scores of thousands of these workers were barbarously exploited in opening the mines of the west and in building the railroads that span the Rockies. Then, in 1882, with European immigration reaching flood-proportions, with radical reconstruction crushed in the South and with its labor "problem" momentarily in hand, the friendly United States government banned further entry of Chinese and forbade their naturalization.

* A good account of this period is in Israel Epstein's *The Unfinished Revolution in China* (Boston, 1947).

Until 1943 and the anti-Axis war, and despite repeated protests by China and boycotts of American goods by Chinese, this shameful legislation remained on the books and was rigorously enforced. Moreover, numerous outrages against the person and property of Chinese here went unpunished. Of this whole chauvinist chapter A. Whitney Griswold, now President of Yale University, wrote:

"The United States could, and did, ignore China's wishes with impunity. It violated existing treaties and dictated others in an overbearing manner. When China balked at the harsh terms demanded by the State Department, Congress dispensed with treaty sanctions altogether, and enacted laws that were even harsher. Scant allowance was made . . . for the sensibilities of a proud and friendly people. The persecution of Chinese subjects in the United States was winked at by the courts and, in effect, condoned by the federal government."*

And what of General Wu's references to the American Open Door policy? Was this, as the United States government spokesmen insist, an act of purest benevolence?

A striking fact appears to begin with. The diplomatic notes by which Secretary of State John Hay projected the Open Door in 1899 were sent to England, Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy and France—but not to China! Yet it *was* China's door. How explain it? Well, the whole house was in hock to seven financiers and if they wanted the door to stay open what they needed was mutual agreement. Given that they'd bloody-well tell the permanent occupant to keep his door open and his mouth shut.

Vultures fall upon a sleeping giant. They agree to share his blood and to drink in moderation. As though vultures could abide by an agreement or curb their greed! As though the giant would sleep forever!

In 1897 the State Department's Bureau of Foreign Commerce referred to "what may be termed an American invasion of the markets of the world" and pointed particularly to

* A. W. Griswold, *The Far Eastern Policy of the U.S.* (N. Y. 1938), pp. 838-89.

China as "one of the most promising." Soon, at the prodding of chambers of commerce, the Secretary of State was anxiously inquiring from Germany and Russia as to their intentions with regard to American property and trade in their Chinese "spheres of influence."

When the United States declared war on Spain in 1898 and Congress solemnly affirmed that we sought only Cuba's freedom, the capitalists knew this meant "we" would pick up assorted pieces of real estate, including the Philippines. Thus, two years before the Senate's ratification of Philippine annexation in 1900, the *New York Journal of Commerce* assumed it and commented that hitherto we had "allowed Great Britain to fight our battle for an open market in China: with our flag floating within 500 miles of Hong Kong we shall be able to give that policy something more than merely moral support in the future."

By September, 1898, President McKinley noted the rapid slicing up of China, but he rejoiced that the country would "be open to international commerce during such alien occupation" and announced that "if no discriminating treatment of American citizens and their trade be found to exist" all would be well. In two months the U.S. Minister to China was telling Secretary Hay that "if real progress is to be made . . . resources developed, markets created, and business established, Orientalism must effectually give way to Occidentalism."

With business—especially such big combines as the American Chinese Development Company—pressing, and England aiding and abetting, the United States in 1899 proposed the Open Door. This, in the doctrine's words, sought "to remove any cause of irritation and to insure at the same time to the commerce of all nations in China the undoubted benefits which should accrue from a formal recognition by the various powers claiming 'spheres of interest' that they shall enjoy perfect equality for their commerce and navigation within such 'spheres.' . . ." All the good friends of China agreed—the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, the German Kaiser, the Russian Czar and the Japanese Emperor.

Everyone agreed—except the Chinese people. And when they demonstrated their disagreement with “spheres” and “open doors” in the Boxer Uprising of 1900, the friends, with heavy hearts and bloody hands, converted them. Among the earnest friends were some 2,000 American troops, and for another half century such friends remained.

Of course the Chinese people had to indemnify the benevolent Powers. With its share of the loot, the United States, after a proper interval and with fitting fanfare, provided schools as additional tools for the maintenance of this strange friendship.

Statements by American leaders of that period substantiate General Wu's characterization of the Open Door. While today Ogden Reid writes in the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* (December 11, 1950) that “imperialism is Communist slang for democracy,” his grandfather, Whitelaw Reid, editor of the old *Tribune*, toured the country in 1899 insisting: “The Pacific Ocean is in our hands now.” He wanted, moreover, “to fence in the China Sea,” thus “doubling our control of the Pacific and of the fabulous trade the Twentieth Century will see it bear.” The U.S. consul-general in Hong Kong, Rouseville Wildman, published a book in 1900 called *China's Open Door* with a laudatory foreword by Charles Denby, who had just been U.S. Minister to China. Here one reads such choice aphorisms as: “The fear of the warship is the beginning of trade.” And, “The best advice I can give to merchants who honestly wish to compete for China's trade, is to imitate the methods of the old-established English and German firms. Gunboats, earnestness, diplomacy will give us our place in the Chinese market.”

The same year that screaming eagle, Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana, told the United States Senate: “The Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific, therefore, is the power that rules the world.” In arguing against self-government for the Filipinos, he insisted: “They are not capable of self-government. How could they be?

... They are Orientals, Malays. . . . What alchemy will change the oriental quality of their blood and set the self-governing currents of the American pouring through their Malay vein?” In his peroration, Senator Beveridge brought Jehovah to his assistance: “God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing. . . . He has made us the master organizers of the world. . . . He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savages and senile peoples.”

Vast masses of the American people, Negro and white together, opposed this robber policy, but the ruling class, its newspapers and its government, approved it. *Senator Beveridge's own speech was read and approved, prior to delivery, by Mr. Perkins of J. P. Morgan & Co., Mr. McCall of the New York Life Insurance Co., Mr. Dodd of Dodd-Mead Publishers, by Governor Theodore Roosevelt of New York, by the U.S. Secretary of State and by President McKinley!**

It was John Hay, himself, the Secretary of State during the enunciation of the Open Door, who, in weighing an American quarrel with Czarist Russia over Manchuria, wrote a friend in 1903 that “the open hand will not be so convincing to the poor devils of Chinks as the raised club.”**

All, all, as Acheson-Austin-Connally & Co. insist, in the name of friendship!

What about the twentieth century? The story has been one of sharply increased efforts at American financial penetration, meeting heightening Chinese resistance. Simultaneously, intra-imperialist squabbles over China intensified, especially as the might of Japanese and American imperialism grew more rapidly than that of their fellow-plunderers.

The contradictions implicit in all this multiplied many times as the bonds of capitalism cracked and the Soviet Union appeared. Immediately, in 1919, Soviet Russia publicly de-

* See Claude G. Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era* (N. Y., 1932), pp. 119-121.

** W. R. Thayer, *The Life and Letters of John Hay* (Boston, 1916), II, p. 369.

clared it "annulled all treaties concluded between the former government of Russia and China, abandons all conquests of Chinese territory and all Russian concessions in China, and restores to China without compensation and for all time all that was predatorily seized from her by the Czarist government and the Russian bourgeoisie."

What a change this meant for China, for Asia, for the colonial world! Just fifteen years before, Czarist Russia and Imperial Japan had fought on her soil as to which might more fully exploit Manchuria, with the United States helping to finance Japan (through Edward H. Harriman and Kuhn, Loeb & Co.).

Typically, too, a State Department official wrote to the U.S. Minister to China in the summer of 1908: "'Wall Street' is feeling confident again and is looking for the investment of capital. . . . It has turned to Manchuria and wants the latest advice on the situation up there. . . . Accordingly, the Secretary [of State] . . . sent word that he wanted [Willard] Straight recalled for the purpose of furnishing information to the interested parties."* Now, Mr. Straight was a representative of J. P. Morgan & Co., and simultaneously U.S. consul-general at Mukden. This provides some of the background for the Root-Takahira agreement of November, 1908, between the United States and Japan. Here was reaffirmed the Open Door policy and here the United States recognized Japan's special interest in Manchuria in return for her promise to keep hands off "our" Philippines. It was left, once again, for Mr. Austin, forty-two years later, to tell the United Nations what a friendly and generous gesture to China was the Root-Takahira agreement!

Characteristic of the period, too, were numerous consortiums, or loans under the most usurious conditions, forced upon China by international bankers and not least those from the United States. Always these were predicated upon political, if not directly military, pressure, sometimes personally applied by the highest figures. Indicative is this communication, sent

* Quoted in A. W. Griswold, cited work, p. 139.

in 1909 by President Taft to Prince Chun, regent of China, in connection with a pending "loan" involving, among others, J. P. Morgan & Co., Edward H. Harriman and the National City Bank:

"I am disturbed at the reports that there is certain prejudiced opposition to your Government's arranging for equal participation by American capital in the present railway loan. . . . I send this message not doubting that your reflection upon the broad phases of this subject will at once have results satisfactory to both countries. . . . I have resorted to this somewhat unusually direct communication with your Imperial Highness, because of the high importance that I attach to the successful result of our present negotiations."*

From 1910 on, with the beginnings of the modern Chinese Revolution led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the imperialists have been busy, through puppets, "loans," treaties and bombs, attempting to restrain China's liberation effort and to intensify the exploitation of her peoples. But more important than a hundred Lansing-Ishii notes and Washington Naval Treaties was the letter Dr. Sun Yat-sen wrote to the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. shortly before his death in March, 1925:

"Dear Comrades, [Dr. Sun began]. While I am here laid low by a sickness against which human skill is helpless, my thoughts are turned to you and to the fate of my country. You are at the head of a union of free republics—the heritage which the immortal Lenin bequeathed to the oppressed peoples. With the aid of this heritage the victims of imperialism will inevitably achieve their liberation from the international system which since ancient times has been rooted in slavery, war and injustice. . . . In bidding you farewell, dear comrades, I express the hope that the day is near when the U.S.S.R. will welcome mighty and free China as a friend and ally, and that in the great struggle for the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the world both allies will march side by side to victory."

Now, will Acheson-Austin-Connally and Co. please explain

* *United States Foreign Relations*, 1909 (Government Printing Office) p. 178. For a definitive study of the consortium method see Frederick V. Field, *American Participation in the China Consortium* (University of Chicago Press, 1931).

to the United Nations why Dr. Sun did not write such a letter to the United States Cabinet rather than to the C.E.C. of the Soviet Union? Did he possibly know that the Cabinet was dominated by such a friend of China as Herbert Hoover, who, "once, expounding his views on labor troubles to a friend, told how he had always found that chaining a Chinese coolie to a stake for a day in the hot sun was conducive to good discipline and a minimum of strikes"?*

Or perhaps Dr. Sun had met that typical correspondent of the American free press, one Rodney Gilbert (lately glorifier for the N.Y. *Herald Tribune* of the virtues of Chiang Kai-shek) who was writing in the twenties about "the blatant clamor of the Chinese radicals for their sovereign rights," the "anti-foreign rabble," "the unspeakable drool . . . about China's rights and aspirations . . ."?**

Meanwhile, the N.Y. *Times* in its disgustingly patronizing way was explaining to the Chinese who called for an end to unequal treaties, "Obviously this cannot be done at the moment" (January 23, 1927); and to those who demanded independence, "The Chinese were determined to be unreasonable whether faced by force or kindness" (February 2, 1927); and that, in any case, the Chinese "Reds hope by their plots and their propaganda to further the cause of Russian imperialism" (March 19, 1927).

To all of which there was then still in American public life one like Senator Borah of Idaho who wrote a friend: "It seems to me that we are overworking these days the 'red' proposition. . . . The 'reds' are not the authors of the child labor rules in China. The 'reds' are not in control of forty of her different cities and ports; and the 'reds' are not maintaining the unjust and unfair customs laws."***

By the thirties the general crisis of capitalism was plain to

* [Robert S. Allen and Drew Pearson], *Washington Merry-Go-Round* (N. Y., 1932), p. 68.

** Quoted in Dorothy Borg, *American Policy and the Chinese Revolution 1925-1928* (N. Y., 1947), p. 92.

*** O. O. Johnson, *Borah of Idaho* (N. Y., 1936), p. 349.

see. Everywhere the turn toward fascism appeared; everywhere depression and unemployment; everywhere jingoism, militarism and aggression. Everywhere, that is, except in the U.S.S.R.

The nearest plunderer, the Japanese ruling class, fell upon China in 1931 like a tiger and while feeding on its body whetted its appetite for devouring the Soviet Union. The other robbers, envious and distrustful, nevertheless urged her on and helped her.

Said the New York *Times*, December 12, 1931, from Harbin:

"It becomes evident that Japan's present military adventure into Manchuria is primarily aimed against the Soviet Union. . . . Many foreign observers, and not a few of the Japanese themselves, believe that Japan will force a war on Russia in the near future, believing that if such a war is inevitable Japan should push her advantage now rather than wait until Russia can complete her Five-Year Plan and become more efficient mechanically and industrially."

Ralph Hendershot, Scripps-Howard financial editor wrote, October 29, 1931: "The Chinese-Japanese squabble, even though it develops into a war, may not be as detrimental as it appears. It might even stimulate trade a bit, and if Russia becomes involved even in a minor way, she may be forced to give up her Five-Year Plan, which has caused no little concern in this country."

Somewhat later, the New York *World-Telegram* (February 2, 1932) reported: "Wall Street remained definitely sympathetic toward the Japanese adventure in China, regarding it as basically a bit of international policing which would benefit business all over the world."

Toward the end of the thirties Japan moved down from Manchuria and Jehol intent upon conquering all China. During these years the United States was Japan's main foreign source of arms and supplies and money. The United States bought 85 per cent of the raw silk exported by Japan in 1935; she bought one-fourth of all Japan's exports in 1936 and sold her one-third of all imports. From 1937 to 1938 the United

States sold Japan over \$325,000,000 worth of war materials, including 75 per cent of Japan's gasoline and over 30 per cent of her steel.

Therefore, said Madame Sun Yat-sen at the time: "If the United States and Great Britain would stop supplying Japan with war materials, the Japanese aggression would be halted within a few months." Former Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson, in a letter to the N.Y. *Times* on October 6, 1937, cited "the lamentable fact" that "the aggression of Japan" was made possible only with the "effective and predominant assistance" of the United States and Great Britain. No wonder Japan's Foreign Minister Hirota found, "America's attitude towards the China incident is fair and just."

And a dozen years later Mr. Austin tells the United Nations that "all during the thirties the United States continued to manifest the gravest concern over Japanese aggression against China" as further proof of "friendship."

There were, in the United States, many who did "manifest the gravest concern," and displayed it not by making profit from bombs that murdered Chinese but by boycotting Japanese products. The entire Left, led by the Communist Party, and the organized labor movement, both A.F. of L. and C.I.O., and masses of Negro people participated in this "premature anti-fascism." Despite boss terror and ridicule by the rich, this boycott helped preserve the honor of the American people and did force a severe decline in importation of Japanese goods by 1938.

Meanwhile, the U.S.S.R. exported no war products to Japan, but rather "openly showed its approval of Chinese resistance from the very beginning, and from the very beginning supplied China with war material and financial aid to the best of its ability."*

During the Second World War, the Anglo-American imperialists continued their support of the traitor Chiang, whose reactionary Kuomintang clique followed the policy of yielding

* Owen and Eleanor Lattimore, *The Making of Modern China* (N. Y., 1944), p. 167.

to Japan, blockading the Communists, squeezing the life-blood out of the Chinese masses.

Joseph W. Stilwell, deputy commander in the Chinese-Burma-India theatre and Chiang's Chief of Staff, wrote: "Chiang Kai-shek is the head of a one-party government supported by a Gestapo and a party secret service. He is now organizing an S.S. of 100,000 members. . . . He will not make an effort to fight [Japan] seriously. He wants to finish the war coasting, with a big supply of material, so as to perpetuate his regime." In Chiang's rule General Stilwell saw, "Greed, corruption, favoritism, more taxes, a ruined currency, terrible waste of life, callous disregard of all the rights of men." And the Communists? They "reduce taxes, rents, interest. Raise production, and standard of living. Participate in government. Practice what they preach."

After three years Stilwell was forced out by Chiang and his American masters. On his return, as his wife testifies, he was surrounded by "the atmosphere of crime" and wondered, only half-facetiously, whether the Army had "a cell ready for me at Leavenworth."***

The post V-J Day period started out auspiciously with this promise from President Truman on December 15, 1945:

"The United States government has long subscribed to the principle that the management of internal affairs is the responsibility of the peoples of sovereign nations. . . . United States support will not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife. . . . The United States government considers that the detailed steps necessary to the achievement of political unity in China must be worked out by the Chinese themselves and that intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate."

The world now knows that fair promises from President Truman herald foul deeds. The lesson came quickly. The New York *Herald Tribune* editorially summed up the matter as of July 24, 1946:

** Theodore H. White, ed., *The Stilwell Papers* (N. Y., 1948).

"Troops controlled by Chinese reactionaries have been transported, armed and trained by Americans. . . . The Kuomintang treasury has been supported by the American treasury. Kuomintang transportation routes have been guarded by American bayonets in American hands. . . . The Chinese reactionaries fully count on American aid for a full-scale civil war. But their very reason for this assumption is sufficient reason to deny what they ask."

A month later Benjamin Welles, Sumner's son, reported in the *N.Y. Times* from China the presence of some 45,000 American Marines. He wrote that, "Not only do the Marines admit the validity of the Communists' charge that America is aiding one Chinese faction against the other, but they also complain strongly among themselves because of Washington's policy."

By the year's end, the *New Statesman and Nation* (November 23, 1946) observed of United States activities in China that "One could find no better example of imperialism than for a great and powerful nation to beat down every defense of an economically undeveloped nation, and thus, as the price of supporting a corrupt and reactionary government in civil war, obtain a grip over its entire economic life."

Meanwhile the last Russian troops had left China by April, 1946. In January, 1947, Secretary of State Marshall reported seeing no evidence of Soviet help to either side in the Chinese civil war and such hostile commentators as George Fielding Eliot and Christopher Rand confessed the same fact later in 1947.

But American absorption of the real function of government in Kuomintang China continued and its military interference became a universally known fact. On November 17, 1948, the *New York Times* published a letter from Dr. Lucius C. Porter, head of the North China Language School in Peiping and Professor Randolph C. Sailer of the American endowed Yenching University in the same still-Kuomintang city. These men said they feared "that our fellow-countrymen at home are not fully aware of one way in which American 'aid' to China is being used in a way that violates American interests as well as human decency and is working powerfully

toward the losing of our battle for men's minds here." They went on to describe the brutal bombing of cities lost by Chiang and said the indiscriminate killing was "entrenching hatred." And the hatred of the Chinese people was directed against the American government for "these planes and their fuel are mostly from America. Many of their pilots are trained there. Their bombs and ammunition are largely American made. . . ."

But Chiang—despite his American backing—continued to lose and desperation appeared in the United States. By December 12, 1948, Hanson Baldwin was writing in the *N.Y. Times* of the advisability of rearming and using Japanese manpower. Supplies and money and "advisers" continued to pour into Chiang's regime, but it continued to shrink. Not enough! screamed the American Chiangs, and by January, 1949, William C. Bullitt was calling for \$800,000,000 and direct, total intervention by the United States in the Chinese civil war, while by March, 1949, Senator McCarran proposed \$1,500,000,000 immediately be appropriated for the same end.

But nothing helped. The giant had awakened and shaken off the vultures forever. History had vindicated the analysis made by Eugene Dennis in his November, 1945, report to the National Committee of the Communist Party. He said:

"The present course of America's policy . . . is calculated to prevent the emergence of a strong and progressive China, to make China an American tool and appendage, and to erect a new anti-Soviet bulwark in the Far East. This policy is doomed to failure. It ignores the real relationship of forces in China and in the Pacific area. And it is as un-American as it is anti-Chinese and anti-Soviet. For it is a policy which can only lead to prolonged civil war in China, to increased imperialist intervention by the United States and to a further worsening of the relations of the great powers in the Pacific . . . it . . . endangers peace and democratic progress in the Far East and hence in the world. . . ."

Four years later and four years late the United States government told the story itself. Its own official report of *United States Relations With China* confessed that the Chinese Com-

* *Political Affairs*, December, 1945, pp. 1065-66.

munists were "the most dynamic force in China." They had "improved the conditions of the peasants" who "for the first time have something to fight for" and they would therefore "continue to fight any government that . . . deprives them of these newly won gains." The United States had paid "more than fifty percent of the monetary expenditures of the Chinese government," while for the Communists "there is little evidence of material assistance from Moscow." Ambassador Stuart informed President Truman that "Our China Aid Program . . . prolonged civil war" and so the United States bears "the onus for supporting and keeping in power an unpopular regime which does not have the interests of the country at heart."

Apparently, all this was not a fitting climax to the Acheson-Austin-Connally record of "friendship." They are intent upon adding their own.

Certain it is that General Wu is absolutely correct when he says "the American imperialists have always, in their relations with China, been the cunning aggressor." "The historical record," as he says, "which distinguishes friend from foe cannot be altered."

But that record certainly was and is being falsified. Why? The American ruling class falsifies the past in order to help corrupt the present and betray the future.

Its purpose in the past was to conquer China and thus Asia. Its purpose now is to conquer Korea and Chinese bases from which to assault the Soviet Union.

This is why in the midst of the premature rejoicing of October, 1950, the Los Angeles *Times* threw aside all restraint:

"The United States has won another war. . . . Despite the fiction of carrying out a U.N. police action, we have a clearer claim to write our own ticket than in 1918 or even in 1945. For we have not only become the mightiest of military nations, we also stand as the fountainhead of the world's diplomatic leadership, of the world's wealth. . . . Who else dominates the seven seas and the air above them?

. . . We truthfully bestride the world like a colossus. Well, somebody's got to be boss. What are we waiting for?"

With somewhat more aplomb, Senator Sparkman of Alabama told the U.N. Economic Committee on October 25: "I wonder how many people appreciate the significance of the war in Korea on the international investment picture. It is possible that the long-range effect of the Korean war will be beneficial to the international flow of private capital."

On to China! See what lies beyond. Did not General Wedemeyer say in 1947 that a Communist China would result "in denying us important air bases for use as staging areas for bombing attacks" whereas a Chiang China would "provide important air and naval bases and . . . manpower"? Does not General Chennault, in his memoirs published in 1949, see air bases in China from which "the slender thread of Russian communications between Eastern and Western Siberia could be snapped" and that "these are the stakes for which we are playing in China"?

Yes, on to China! Did we promise not to cross the thirty-eighth parallel? Well, in January, 1950, President Truman and Secretary Acheson both solemnly reaffirmed the Cairo declaration that Formosa (Taiwan) is Chinese, but six months later both professed such doubts about its status that they wanted the "question" submitted to the U.N., while the U.S. Navy "neutralized" it.

Finally, didn't General MacArthur, that master Orientalist, affirm that when the Chinese Republic warned it would not tolerate a hostile, aggressive alien-dominated regime at its border it was "bluffing"? Didn't he, who really knew the "Oriental mind," assert "the Chinese were demoralized" and didn't he therefore expect "a pushover"? (*U.S. News & World Report*, December 8, 1950, pp. 21-22).

He got his "pushover," and with it lost how many precious young lives?

General Wu not only was correct in blasting the imperialist policy of the United States as a policy traditionally hostile to the Chinese people. He spoke truly, too, when he affirmed that

this policy "is detrimental to the interests of the American people." It is this real distinction between the interests of the American ruling class and the American people that Acheson-Austin-Connally & Co. seek to hide by their falsification of the past. It is this real distinction which, if grasped and acted upon, guarantees the defeat of American imperialism and a future of peace and freedom for all humanity.

SEPTEMBER, 1951

Franco and American Morality

PRESIDENT TRUMAN, IN 1951, GREETED JOSE FELIZ DE LEQUERICA, Franco's newly-appointed Ambassador, by saying, "Every nation of the free world may be called upon to bear its share of sacrifices and make its contribution to the survival of Western civilization." Dr. Goebbels, in 1937, made public Hitler's backing of Franco by saying, "The fight which General Franco is waging, with the support of all constructive elements, against the Bolshevik menace to his native land is at the same time a fight for civilization."

When Harry Truman and Joseph Goebbels spoke of "free world" and "constructive elements" and "civilization" what did they have in mind? Clearly, as the above quotations show, they had in mind, among other things, Franco Spain.

And what is this Franco Spain?

In 1946 the Security Council of the United Nations charged a sub-committee with answering this question. Here was its unanimous report, dated June of that year:

"In origin, nature, structure and general conduct, the Franco regime is a Fascist regime patterned on, and established largely as a result of aid received from Hitler's Nazi Germany and Mussolini's Fascist Italy."

What, in human terms, does this mean? Let the reply come from American eye-witnesses.

John T. Whitaker, New York *Herald Tribune* correspondent with the forces of Franco during the Civil War, tells of his regime's eminently appropriate birth: "It was the shooting in cold blood of innocent men and women that got me. . . . They

must have averaged thirty killings a day . . . simple peasants and workers . . . prisoners and civilians. . . . 'We've got to kill and kill and kill,' one of Franco's chief press officers used to say to me. He was Captain Aquilera, the seventeenth Count of Yeltes, a great landowner. . . ." (*Foreign Affairs*, October, 1942).

The immediate post-Civil War years are illuminated by this sentence from the study of Thomas J. Hamilton, New York *Times* correspondent in Spain, 1939-1941: "The head of the Spanish public service estimated that the death rate in 1941 was double what it had been before the civil war" (*Appease-ment's Child*, Knopf, 1943, p. 196).

During the years that Hitler's air force and navy used Spanish bases, when Himmler's secret police crawled over Spain, and Franco's Blue Division murdered, looted, raped—and was decimated—in the Soviet Union, *Life* magazine investigated the land. It found "Franco Spain a preview of the 'post-war world' which the Axis proposes to set up if the democracies permit themselves to be defeated in battle."

In jail, said *Life*, were 500,000 political prisoners and these were men and women of remarkable caliber for "most people of brains and talent were generally on the Loyalist side." The correspondent noted that the Valencia concentration camp was particularly strong in musicians, with its inmates including "some of the greatest violinists in Spain" (April 19, 1943).

During the same year a reporter for *The Christian Century* (Dec. 1, 1943) disclosed some interesting details as to the way Franco, guardian of Western civilization, permitted his guards to entertain "the people of brains and talent":

"In Zaragoza the Spanish republican deputy, Casimiro Sarria, was tied to a wooden cross and beaten to death. . . . In Madrid prisoners are hung up by their feet. In Alicante small bundles of matches are burned under their feet until they become unconscious. In Asturia the guerrilla miners, when captured, are nailed to tables and left to die slowly."

And after World War II? The same.

1946: Emmet John Hughes: * "Interrogation of the prisoner . . . involves the use of a select number of vicious devices . . . the extraction of fingernails and toenails . . . the eyes and genitals [are] submitted to a variety of punishments. Female prisoners receive treatment, in the best medieval tradition, expressly designed for their more sensitive organs . . . a punishing but rather costly gas treatment . . . the passage of electric current . . . the use of leather belts in floggings or of heavy boots ground into the stomach . . . the tortures and the executions are not accidental or incidental vices in the character of the regime, They are the character of the regime. . . ."

1947: Kay Boyle in *The Nation* (May 24): ". . . there had been a new round-up of professional people and intellectuals . . . girls go out to their execution, walking two by two across the prison courtyard in the gray of the morning like young girls on their way to school."

1948: L. Bush-Kekete in *Life* (October 11): "Franco's is the only smiling face in Spain . . . unbelievable poverty of the people."

1950: Daniel M. Friedenberg in the *New Republic* (February 20): ". . . pure and simple repression of every liberal thought and action. . . . Anatole France and Victor Hugo are forbidden reading."

1951: Cyrus L. Sulzberger in the *New York Times* (February 7-10): ". . . a regime heartily disliked even in its own land . . . dogma increasingly in the outmoded form of the sixteenth century. . . . Although the Spanish worker was poor fifteen years ago, he is twice as poor today. . . ."

How have the writers of the United States responded to the crucifixion of Spain? At first with honor to literature's traditional partisanship for freedom. But as the terrible years

* Mr. Hughes, formerly of the diplomatic service, served in the U.S. Military Intelligence in Madrid, from 1943-1946. Subsequently, he has been head of the *Life-Time* Rome bureau. While in Madrid, ostensibly, as he says, editing "informational and propaganda material" his time "was primarily dedicated to work of another sort: political intelligence"—*Report from Spain* (Holt, 1947, p. 191).

of the Cold War toll on, the silent acquiescence in butchery becomes more and more deafening.

Upton Sinclair dedicated his 1937 novel, *No Pasaran*, to "one of the great heroic episodes of history," the formation of the International Brigade.

This was typical of the literature of the late thirties with men like John Gates, Robert Thompson, Milton Wolff, Alvah Bessie, Steve Nelson, Dr. Edward Barsky frequently appearing in books and shorter pieces by Hemingway, Caldwell, Sheean, Irwin Shaw, MacLeish, Steinbeck and Maxwell Anderson.

The denunciations of Franco, then, were very nearly unanimous. John Steinbeck felt it "rather insulting" in 1938 to be asked how he stood on Spain for, he asked: "Have you seen anyone not actuated by greed who was for Franco?" Maxwell Anderson found Franco, then, to be "a most contemptible figure," while Irwin Shaw's "sympathies and hopes" were "completely with the people of Republican Spain . . . shamefully deserted and betrayed by the great democracies." And Erskine Caldwell, in Barcelona's ruins, "wondered how it would feel to have a government that sends aviation and bombs to kill women and children."

Ernest Hemingway pointed out in *New Masses* (June 22, 1937) that "A writer who will not lie cannot live or work under fascism," while Archibald MacLeish, in the same magazine, saw the struggle against Franco as one for decency and so was proud to "claim the war as ours."

During the Second World War, Dorothy Thompson announced that "The most dangerous man in the world the day after victory . . . will be Franco" (*The Nation*, Feb. 5, 1944). And *The Saturday Review of Literature* (July 24, 1943) featured William Rose Benet's stirring "Oil of Spain" which extolled

*"Pasionaria, tall and pale,
from where Asturias scorns the vale,"*
and lamented that
"So soon, so soon, the legend fades

*of International Brigades—
so soon we appease—hat swept to knees,
those whose decrees bring hell!"*

At this time Carlton J. H. Hayes, Roosevelt's Ambassador in Madrid, was telling Franco's Foreign Minister that he "was seriously troubled by the continuing attacks on Russia by Spanish leaders and by the Spanish press. . . ."

"I fear [he went on] lest the Spanish Government may have the impression that the Government of the United States is quite complacent over this anti-Russian attitude of the Spanish Government and its officially controlled press. This is not the case. . . . Russia is an important member of the United Nations. Any attack on Russia, therefore, is an attack on an important ally of the United States.

"Communism is, in the last analysis, an essentially internal problem. If conditions for the development of communism do not exist within a country, that country need not become communist. . . . My government does not subscribe to the theory frequently expressed by Spanish officials, that the present war must end in a war against communism. . . ."

Therefore, concluded Ambassador Hayes in this remarkable document, Spain should recall its troops from the Eastern Front, "cease attacking Russia" and "stop pretending that Germany's aggression against Russia is a crusade, when the German Government itself has admitted, on numerous occasions that it is a war of conquest." (*Harper's*, December, 1944).

But it was English, American and French "non-intervention" as well as German and Italian arms which had put Franco in power, and many powerful forces in the United States, and the rest of the capitalist world, thought as did Franco. Indeed, a year before, Hayes himself had been the host of Cardinal Spellman who had come to interview Franco and reported in *Collier's* that the Fascist was "a man loyal to his God, devoted to his country's welfare, and definitely willing to sacrifice himself in any capacity and to any extent for Spain," and that when he smiles "he is indeed very pleasant."

It is this ambivalence towards Spain, reflecting the ambivalence in the bourgeois democracies' entire role in World War II, to which Thomas Mann pointed in January, 1945. Mann, speaking at a Madison Square Garden rally in New York called by *The Nation* and meeting under the slogan "Break With Franco Now," declared:

"The Spanish Caudillo is as cruel a hangman of liberty and democracy as Hitler or Mussolini. To make common cause with him, to bolster his shaking pedestal by making treaties with him—a sworn enemy of our cause—to concede a position of neutrality to him, is equivalent to a confession before the world that we do not know what we want or that we know only too well that in secret we want the survival of fascism."

There is no more glaring example of Truman's betrayal of Roosevelt's foreign policy than the evolving of U.S. policy towards Franco in the last few years. Roosevelt said, March 10, 1945, having special reference to Spain, "I can see no place in the community of nations for governments founded on fascist principles." Truman's government, on the other hand, has in fact been the main prop of Franco's regime.

American aid to Franco has grown with the growth in the organized wrath of the Spanish people. Active intercession came in February, 1949, when Chase National Bank lent the Fascist Butcher 25 million dollars. In the Fall of that year a delegation of U.S. Congressmen fawned over the Killer they planned to revive, and one of them gushed for the press about the "very, very lovely and lovable character," Franco. Simultaneously, several units of the U.S. Mediterranean Fleet entered Spanish ports and its Admiral Conolley visited El Caudillo.

By January, 1950, Secretary Acheson publicly informed Senator Connally that "organized propaganda" magnified the Spanish question; that "there is no sign of an alternative" to Franco; that his "internal position . . . is strong"; that the United States wanted to negotiate a "new Treaty of

Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation" with Franco; and that he wished Franco would "lift the restriction of 25 percent on the participation of foreign investors in any Spanish enterprise and accord better treatment to existing foreign investments" thus enhancing "the flow of investment to Spain." Mr. Acheson concluded on that crusading note.

In March, 1950, Chase National and National City lent Franco 30 millions more and in April, Defense Secretary Johnson let it be known that the United States wanted air bases in Spain for—as the peace-loving commercial press put it—"the strategic bombing of Russia." By September, the McCarran Amendment to the Marshall Plan is added, with Truman still pretending opposition, and this "lends" over 62 millions more to Franco.

Then the United Nations, under the U.S. whip, drops its diplomatic boycott of Franco, his former Foreign Minister is accepted as Ambassador, an American millionaire is accepted as his opposite number in Madrid, and things begin to buzz in earnest.

By January, 1951, the free and unregimented press of America—led by *Life* and the *Herald Tribune*—finds it absurd not to have a full-scale alliance with the consistently anti-Communist Franco.

The final clincher for the Democratic Truman comes in the magnificent strikes and demonstrations against Franco of hundreds of thousands of Spaniards in the spring and early summer of 1951. Quickly—in July—Admiral Sherman succeeds, just before expiring, in getting promises of nine air and naval bases from Franco. The press here announces a "democratic" reorganization of Franco's cabinet, to wit: General Augusto Munoz Grande is made Secretary of War—he commanded the Blue Division in World War II and his democratic tendencies are attested by the Iron Cross with palms that Hitler gave him!

What else is involved is not certain at this writing; probably a grant of several hundreds of millions to the grafters, leeches and torturers who make up the Franco regime and a loosening,

by Franco, on the restrictions against foreign investments in Spain.

When the Sherman deal was announced a delegation of heroic Spaniards appeared at the U.S. Embassy and left a note: "The United States will buy a dictator but they will not be buying a people in any of its aspects."

Yes, in Madrid, under the noses of the Falangist torturers a delegation protests the sale of their country. But what of us here, what of the American people, the American working class, the American writers whose government bulwarks sadists and spits into the faces of the starving men, women and children of Spain?

So many fine words in the past, Messrs. Steinbeck, Caldwell, Hemingway, MacLeish and Shaw! Nothing but pip-squeaks of fright or grunts of approval now? Or silence—dead silence?

"Hear this voice," wrote Miguel Hernandez, martyred Spanish poet:

*"The earth will be a dense heart, desolated,
if you, nations, men, worlds,
with the whole of my people,
and yours as well on their side,
do not break the ferocious fangs."*

Truman has chosen to sharpen those fangs. An outcry of horror and shame from the American people can stop this crime against humanity.

JULY, 1954

Marx and American Scholarship

THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY has a most noble theme: "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof." Orators participating in the celebration expounded the theme with eloquence. Columbia's president Grayson Kirk, for example, urged 500 seniors to fight for "the utmost freedom of intellectual inquiry." Should that fight ever be abandoned, he said, "neither this or any other society can long endure." He stated his conclusion without equivocating: "We must maintain the greatest possible opportunities for the free clash of opinions on all subjects."

Columbia's preceding president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, also took part in the celebration, and much of what he said was stirring and unequivocal, too. For example:

"Whenever, and for whatever alleged reason, people attempt to crush ideas, to mask their convictions, to view every neighbor as a possible enemy, to seek some kind of divining rod by which to test for conformity, a free society is in danger. Wherever man's right to knowledge and the use thereof is restricted, man's freedom in the same measure disappears."

That such distinguished personages should feel moved to offer such warm defenses of "the free clash of opinions" and such stern warnings against efforts "to crush ideas" would appear to indicate that there may possibly be some inhibitions against the fullest and most free expression of certain ideas. Would this writer be wrong if he stated that the ideas of Karl Marx were perhaps not enjoying complete freedom to participate in the "clash of opinions" for which the two eminent presidents so ardently called?

A few days before Mr. Eisenhower rebuked those who would crush ideas, his Subversive Activities Control Board terminated hearings designed to crush the Jefferson School of Social Science, which as the Government admits is a *school* and deals only in ideas—albeit leaning heavily towards those of Marx. And two days after Mr. Eisenhower's splendid castigation of those who would crush ideas, we find him—golf enthusiast that he is—"posting his score," as the *New York Times* put it, on the campaign to crush people whose *ideas* he found distasteful.

That is, Mr. Eisenhower proudly announced, on June 2, that in his first sixteen months as President, his Administration had arrested or convicted sixty-eight men and women for "conspiring to advocate" the ideas of Marxism, and that now there were 255 organizations listed by the Attorney General as tainted with subversive ideas and that over 500 people have been deported or barred or denaturalized because of their ideas. So, on Monday the President castigates those who would crush ideas; on Wednesday he commends his own Administration because he thinks it is "quietly and relentlessly" crushing the ideas of Communists!

It is a fact, and everyone knows it, that the ideas most assaulted today are those of Marx. These are the ones *verboten* in American universities—not least Columbia University—and yet those who lead in the repression, lament its existence.

True, Columbia's bicentennial motto never has prevailed in American universities. They have always been dominated by ecclesiastical and, more recently, financial hierarchies, and these have been particularly interested in distorting or censoring unorthodox and dissenting views, notably those of Marx. Nevertheless, it is also a fact that the greatest figures of the past in American academic history have resisted this assault upon reason and have, specifically, upheld the right to study Marx's ideas.

Indeed, these greatest intellectual figures—and this is a part

of their greatness—not only upheld the right to study Marx, but insisted upon the necessity to study him if one was to have some grasp of reality. They acknowledged in Marx one of the outstanding geniuses in world history and therefore knew that any "university" which barred Marx could only be a place of miseducation; that any "teacher" who ignored or caricatured his ideas could only be a fraud; and that any student who was kept from those ideas was being cheated in his efforts to get at the truth. And they held to this notwithstanding vituperation and persecution.

It will not be amiss today to bring forward something of this most noble tradition in American academic history, and we propose to do it through the writings of the greatest giants in that history. I think that no one preparing a list of the dozen most eminent American university figures in the social sciences could fail to include these six names: Charles A. Beard (1874-1948); John R. Commons (1862-1945); James Harvey Robinson (1863-1936); E. R. A. Seligman (1861-1939); Albion W. Small (1854-1926); and Thorstein Veblen (1857-1929).

Each of these men was so distinguished that only the barest biographical data are necessary. Beard and Veblen were, respectively, the foremost historian and economist in American academic circles. Albion W. Small, a president of Colby College, was the founder of the first Department of Sociology (at the University of Chicago) and the founder and editor for many years, of the *American Journal of Sociology*. James Harvey Robinson, one of Beard's teachers, with whom Beard collaborated in early writing, was a Professor of History at Columbia University for almost thirty years, a founder of the New School for Social Research, and a one-time President of the American Historical Association. John R. Commons served for nearly thirty years as Professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin and pioneered in the study of the American labor movement. Finally, E. R. A. Seligman was a professor of Economics at Columbia University for forty-five years, editor of the *Political Science Quarterly*,

Editor-in-Chief of the *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, and a President of the American Economic Association.

All these great scholars repeatedly referred in their lectures and writings to the ideas of Karl Marx, and—as befitted their stature—did not fail to mention explicitly the name of the man whose ideas they were considering or using. They were not themselves Marxists, but always they dealt with Marx respectfully and with a sense of responsibility. They did not use Marxism as an epithet; rather they treated it as one of the great seminal systems of world thought.

Since references to and discussions of Marxism recur in their work, it is not possible within the limits of an essay to offer a rounded presentation of their estimates of Marxism. But it is possible to offer representative excerpts which will be sufficient to establish my point. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to remark that many of the formulations in these excerpts are, I think, faulty. But that is irrelevant to our present purpose, namely, to indicate the respect and admiration which these leading American scholars had for Marx's ideas.

Thus, in one of James Harvey Robinson's books (*History*, Columbia University Press, 1908) we find this passage:

"It was a philosopher, economist and reformer, not a professional student of history, who suggested a wholly new and wonderful series of questions which the historian might properly ask about the past, and moreover furnished him with a scientific explanation of many matters hitherto ill-understood. I mean Karl Marx."

John R. Commons, in an article devoted to a critique of "Marx Today"—and written out of Professor Commons' conviction, typical in that period, that "Ford had vanquished Marx"—nevertheless remarked: "Karl Marx, the founder of materialistic socialism, is recognized by economists as one of the three or four greatest minds who have contributed to the progress of economic science" (*Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. 1925).

Similarly, Thorstein Veblen, in a series of articles entitled, "The Socialist Economics of Karl Marx and his Followers,"

felt it necessary to tell the academicians reading the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, that Marx was to be studied with great care and attention, that he was "neither ignorant, imbecile or disingenuous" and that: "There is no system of economic theory more logical than that of Marx" (issues of August 1906 and February 1907). Joseph Dorfman, in his definitive biography of Veblen (Viking Press, 1935), cites Veblen's remark that Marx was "coming to be more widely appreciated as he becomes better understood." To his students, Veblen would often say, Professor Dorfman records, "Read Marx. Uncover the roots of the problem."

Professor Seligman, in a book devoted to an exposition (not very successful, I believe) of Marx's historical materialism, referred to Marx "as one of those great pioneers who, even if they are not able themselves to reach the goal, nevertheless blaze out a new and promising path in the wilderness of human thought and progress." Of Marx's philosophy of history, Professor Seligman declared:

"Whether or not we are prepared to accept it as an adequate explanation of human progress in general, we must all recognize the beneficent influence that it has exerted in stimulating the thoughts of scholars and in broadening the concepts and the ideals of history and economics alike. If for no other reason, it will deserve well of future investigators and will occupy an honored place in the record of mental development and scientific progress." (*The Economic Interpretation of History*, Columbia University Press, 1902).

Albion W. Small published a long essay, "Socialism in the Light of Social Science" in the *American Journal of Sociology*, in May, 1912. His theme was stated in one italicized sentence: "*Socialism has been the most wholesome ferment in modern society.*" Of Marx himself, this outstanding American sociologist wrote:

"Marx was one of the few really great thinkers in the history of social science. His repute thus far has been that of every challenger of tradition. All the conventional, the world over, from the multitude of intellectual nonentities

to thinkers whose failure to acknowledge in him more than a peer has seriously impeached their candor, have implicitly conspired to smother his influence by all the means known to obscurantism. From outlawry to averted glances, every device of repression and misrepresentation has been employed against him. . . .

"He is worthy of the most respectful treatment which thinkers can pay to another thinker whose argument has never been successfully answered. . . .

"I confidently predict that in the ultimate judgment of history, Marx will have a place in social science analogous with that of Galileo in physical science. . . ."

Charles A. Beard, expressing annoyance at being baited as a "Marxian" by a stuffed-shirt ignoramus who knew as little of Marx's philosophy as he did of Beard's, went on to write: "Yet I freely pay tribute to the amazing range of Marx's scholarship and the penetrating character of his thought." Summing up Marx's prodigious attainment in history, philosophy, economics and linguistics, Beard concluded:

"However much one may dislike Marx's personal views, one cannot deny to him wide and deep knowledge—and a fearless and sacrificial life. He not only interpreted history, as everyone does who writes any history, but he helped to make history. Possibly he may have known something. At least the contemporary student, trying to look coldly and impartially on thought and thinkers in the field of historiography, may learn a little bit at least, from Karl Marx." (*American Historical Review*, Oct. 1935)

I have not, of course, called to the witness stand six leading figures in the history of American scholarship in order to vindicate Marx or his philosophy. In the first place they were not partisans of that philosophy and in the second place the vindication is being written in life.

But I have brought forward the testimony of these six giants as tending to show the stultifying effect of the present all but complete prohibition of the study of Marx's thought which afflicts our educational system. I have brought it forward, too, in order to vindicate the right of schools and scholars to teach the Marxist world-outlook and the right,

indeed, the duty, of the youth and of men and women to study that outlook.

To speak of serious instruction, to talk about "the search for truth"—not to mention academic freedom—and to keep from students the ideas of a Galileo in the social sciences, of a mind which ranks among the three or four greatest, of one who was a great pioneer blazing new and promising paths in the wilderness of human thought (to paraphrase Small, Commons and Seligman), to do this, is to deceive and not to enlighten.

To acquiesce, in the sacred names of freedom and loyalty and patriotism, while corrupt ignoramuses in state legislatures, on Congressional committees, in Boards of Education, fire teachers and terrorize school systems so that students may not heed Veblen's advice, "Study Marx," or Beard's characteristically understated suggestion of "learning a little bit at least from Karl Marx"—to be a party to this is not to be an educator but rather to be a betrayer of that high calling and an accomplice in the assault upon reason.

Happily, the very instance we cited to show the demagoguery of President Eisenhower—namely, the effort to suppress the Jefferson School—also brought forth most heartening evidences of the mounting resistance to witch-hunting and to fascism.

At the hearings before the Control Board, when the government's informers had finished their bought-and-paid-for recitals, four scholars appeared in defense of academic freedom, of scientific inquiry and of the Bill of Rights. These four men hold differing views but they undertook a common task because of a common conviction: their ardent and real belief in maintaining "the greatest possible opportunities for the free clash of opinions on all subjects" and their awareness that Marxism is an indispensable component of the world's culture and thought.

One of the four, on the stand for nine days, was the distinguished Marxist, Dr. Howard Selsam, the School's Director, and formerly Professor of Philosophy at Brooklyn College.

It was to be expected that the School's Director would stoutly defend it, but that one expected this from Dr. Selsam withdraws nothing from the honor which is his for having so splendidly fulfilled the expectations.

The appearance of the three other witnesses for the School was even more notable, in present-day America, since these were not officials of the institution. One, the celebrated Dean of American scholars, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, had, it is true, lectured at the School, but, as he testified, he had recently delivered substantially the same lectures at Princeton, the University of Chicago and the New School for Social Research. The other two had no connection at all with the Jefferson School. Their coming forward in defense of the School's right to exist and to teach Marxism, can only be characterized as heroic and as offering a profound source of encouragement for all who envision an America free of McCarran Boards, Smith Acts, Brownell Lists and McCarthy Filth. These men who stood forth were Robert S. Cohen, Assistant Professor of Physics and Philosophy at Connecticut Wesleyan University, and Dr. Broadus Mitchell, Professor of Economics at Rutgers University.

In coming forward as they did, despite the severe pressures of the time and, in some cases, despite their own sharp disagreements with the Marxist view, these teachers represent the best in American academic tradition. And in their high estimate of the contributions of Marx to world thought they likewise were carrying forward that which in the past had marked the giants of American university life.

It is not only Marxists, then, who should insist on the necessity of teaching and studying the ideas of Marx. For those ideas, as *The Columbia Encyclopedia* says, have "exerted an incalculable influence on the modern world." All who value scientific inquiry must resist today, as Small, Commons, Seligman, Robinson, Veblen, and Beard did in the past, the suppression of Marxism which lies at the root of the campaign of intellectual intimidation that everywhere is stifling creative effort and feeding the rise of fascism.

5. POLEMICS ON CLASS JUSTICE

Behind the Hiss Frame-Up

"THE AFFAIR IS ONLY NOW BEGINNING," WROTE ZOLA YEARS after Dreyfus was confined, "because only now is the situation clear."

So may one write today of the Hiss case, years after its principal disappeared behind the bars of the Federal Penitentiary in Lewisburg, Pa.

First, let us get the main facts straight: In August, 1948, Whittaker Chambers, senior editor of *Time* magazine, testifying under oath before the House Un-American Activities Committee, declared that Alger Hiss—and his wife, Priscilla, and his brother, Donald—had been members of the Communist Party, and, as such, had sought, not to further the interests of the U.S., but to damage them. Alger Hiss, then president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and previously a chief officer of the State Department under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman,* branded the testimony false and challenged Chambers to repeat it outside the privileged House hearing so that he might be subject to libel charges. Chambers did so, and in September, 1948, Hiss brought suit for \$75,000 damages.

At a pre-trial examination, held in Baltimore, Chambers repeated that Hiss had been a Communist Party member and added—what he had hitherto denied under oath—that he had also been a spy. Moreover, said Chambers, Hiss had turned

* Hiss had been assistant to the State Department's Adviser on Political Relations; secretary of the American Delegation to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference; director of the State Department's Office of Special Political Affairs; adviser to President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference; officer in charge of security at the founding of the United Nations at San Francisco; principal adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the first meeting of the U.N. Assembly.

over to him—Chambers—confidential State Department documents, handwritten and typed, which he swore were given him by Hiss more than a decade earlier.

These documents, at the insistence of Hiss, were turned over to the Department of Justice. They proved to be, indeed, copies or condensations of State Department documents, in Hiss' handwriting or in typing identifiable as coming from a typewriter at one time in the Hiss household.

The identification of the typing was made possible because the original typewriter was recovered. Quite remarkable was the fact that the F.B.I., which scoured the region seeking the machine, failed, but somehow the Hisses themselves were able to track it down. It was, then, Hiss who gave the authorities the machine which made possible the identification of the typed documents as coming from his former typewriter.

Haled before a grand jury, Hiss insisted that he had never been a member of the Communist Party and had not turned over any State Department documents or extracts from them to Chambers. Chambers said the opposite and in December, 1948, Alger Hiss was indicted for perjury. The specific charges were that Hiss lied in swearing that he had not, "in or about the months of February and March, 1938," transmitted the indicated documents to Chambers and that he lied when he testified that "he had not seen Chambers (known to him as George Crosley) after January 1, 1937."

He stood trial from May to July, 1949, but the jury was unable to reach a verdict. Hiss' second trial started in November, 1949, and ended in January, 1950. The jury found him guilty and on January 25, 1950 he was sentenced to five years' imprisonment. The Appeals Court rejected his plea, the Supreme Court—with the courage characteristic of it during the "Cold War" years—refused to hear the case, and on March 22, 1951, Alger Hiss began serving his sentence. In January, 1952, Hiss' attorneys moved for a new trial on the basis of newly discovered evidence, but the motion was denied. The prisoner's parole applications have been rejected, and he remains behind bars.

Chambers, admittedly guilty of repeated perjury and also avowing himself guilty of espionage, has suffered neither indictment nor imprisonment. On the contrary, he has received the encomium of the Justice Department, a very handsome financial settlement from Mr. Luce of *Time* (who regretfully accepted his resignation), and hundreds of thousands of dollars from the publication of his harrowing accounts of the "Communist menace" to our country, to civilization, and to morality.

Concerning the consequences of Hiss' conviction, the English journalist, Alistair Cooke, who reported both trials, wrote:

"[It] brought back into favor the odious trade of the public informer. It gave the FBI an unparalleled power of inquiry into private lives . . . it tended to make conformity sheepish, and to limit by intimidation . . . the curiosity and idealism of the young. It helped therefore to usher in a period when a high premium would be put on the chameleon and the politically neutral slob."*

Mr. Cooke's list is perceptive and weighty; yet, it is incomplete. Probably of minor importance is the fact that Hiss' prosecutor, Thomas Murphy, Jr., was promoted in time to a federal judgeship, while his original inquisitor at the House hearing, Representative Richard M. Nixon of California, soon became a senator and later, of course, Vice-President.

But something of major significance is omitted by Mr. Cooke; indeed, he misses the most consequential result of the Hiss conviction. This was stated by Milton Howard, associate editor of the *Daily Worker*, when he wrote that the conviction of Hiss "is one of the main props for the McCarthy propaganda that the Roosevelt Administration was 'Communist-infiltrated' and that the New Deal attitudes—with relation to Labor, the Soviet Union, China, the Hitler Axis, Yalta, etc.—were the result of such 'infiltration'."

The Hiss conviction helped identify, in the minds of many Americans, "Communism" with espionage and treason and,

* *A Generation on Trial*, p. 340.

further identifying "Communism" with the New Deal, helped besmirch all progressive and liberal thought and action, all anti-fascist and democratic objectives and activities. The most recent confirmation of this comes from the report of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee (the Jenner Committee), published in full in *U.S. News & World Report* (August 28), and the remarks by Attorney General Brownell on the "menace of Communism," published in the following issue of the same magazine. In both cases the Hiss conviction is a basic bulwark of the argument; in the Jenner Report, it is cited explicitly in connection with smearing the entire New Deal period. The conviction of Hiss made possible the execution of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg.

Doubts as to the guilt of Hiss appeared with the first accusations. Among those who knew that Chambers' picture of the Communist Party as an espionage agency whose members were liars, thieves and assassins in the service of the U.S.S.R., had absolutely nothing in common with truth, his specific accusations against Alger Hiss were regarded as threadbare lies.

And even among many who more or less accepted the Chambers (and Goebbels) version of "Communism," profound doubt persisted as to the actual guilt of Hiss. The villainous character of Chambers, his abnormal behavior—fears of assassination, attempts at suicide, sudden disappearances—naturally provoked doubts as to his story. On the other hand, the good personal character of Alger Hiss, attested by all who knew him, including two Justices of the Supreme Court, and particularly his reputation for honesty and integrity, made belief in Chambers' tale very difficult.

Moreover, the patent political motivations of the charges (launched a few months prior to the 1948 elections) and the ultra-reactionary character of Chambers and his closest associates (Isaac Don Levine and Alfred Kohlberg) provided clear, and very suspect, motivation for the charges. Adding to the

incredible nature of the whole affair was the bizarre manner in which the evidence was brought forward: some documents in dumbwaiters for ten years, and others hidden in a pumpkin. Finally, there was the fact that Hiss had repeatedly and recently been investigated for "disloyalty" by the F.B.I. and been cleared.

The American judicial system spent five months weighing the evidence as between Chambers and Hiss. Its verdict—Hiss was "guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." That would appear to settle it—or would it?

Most unsettling is the recently published volume, *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss*, by the Earl Jowitt.* The Earl Jowitt of Stevenage was until two years ago Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, a major judicial and cabinet post. The Earl Jowitt studied the voluminous record of the Hiss-Chambers proceedings from the appearances before the House Committee in 1948 through the conviction at the second trial. He read also the two other books on the case (by Alistair Cooke, already cited, and *Seeds of Treason* by Victory Lasky and Ralph de Toledano), and Chambers' own autobiographical concoction, *Witness*. Thus prepared and fortified, he produced in his volume a 380-page study of the evidence and decided that the case against Alger Hiss was not established, that his guilt was not proven. Therefore, though the Earl does not allow himself to say it in so many words, the finding of the jury was faulty and the continued imprisonment of Alger Hiss represents an injustice.

The Earl reaches these conclusions despite his own profound opposition to Communism. He begins by stating: "I have no sympathy whatever with the Communist ideology so far as I understand it. . . ." It is clear from other passages that his understanding is most faulty, but this is not the place to argue this question. It is relevant, however, to point out that the Earl's misunderstanding of Communism is so complete that he generally accepts Chambers' version of it and

* Doubleday.

feels that espionage, treason and murder are all part of its nature.

The Earl writes with the greatest urbanity. His language is always most respectful of the vested authorities and there is never a hint of unworthy motivations on their part. The most he can bring himself to write are phrases such as: "I feel quite certain that Mr. Murphy [the prosecutor] did not realize he was being unfair" or "I am bound to say that in my opinion it was a suggestion which should not have been made. . . ."

That such an author, preeminent in the field of law, close student of most of the relevant documents and ready to believe anything of Communists so long as it is evil, should find himself compelled to dissent from the verdict of an American court and the functioning of American judges in the Hiss case, represents a heavy blow to that judicial system—i.e., to that begowned guardian of U.S. imperialism.

It is no wonder that the book's reception by the commercial press here was as a rule just short of outraged hysteria. *Newsweek* denounced its "evident bias" and the *Chicago Tribune* its "special pleading"—both themselves, of course, models of objectivity! *The New Leader* devoted one-third of an issue to a denunciation of the "new whitewash of Alger Hiss" from "an otherwise [!] distinguished jurist," the climactic "proof" of Hiss' guilt being the fact that he, Hiss, "was earnest, high-minded, conscientious and almost ascetic in his private life"! Merle Miller, in the *New Republic* dismissed the book as "silly and inconsequential," and affirmed his conviction that Hiss was "a perjurer and one-time espionage agent."

There were, however, a few exceptions. The Columbus, Ohio, *Citizen* found the book "scholarly and brilliant," while the Kansas City *Star* went somewhat further, remarking that this work, "as Shakespeare wrote about another tempest, 'gives one furiously to think'." More unequivocal, and really a remarkable tribute to the book's persuasiveness, was the response of Morris L. Ernst, a well-known attorney whose hostility to Communism has been notorious even in our

country. Reviewing the book in *The Saturday Review* (August 1), Ernst reports that while he still believes Hiss lied in declaring that he did not see Chambers after 1937, on the most significant of the counts in the indictment he feels otherwise: "Now, on the basis of the accumulation of evidence offered in the book rather than on any particular points, I greatly doubt the correctness of the jury's verdict that Hiss lied when he denied that he had turned secret documents over to Chambers."

What is it that the Earl Jowitt sees in the record and documents of the Hiss case that leads him to doubt the man's guilt? What is it that he brings forward which changes the mind of a Morris Ernst and leads him to reject the jury's verdict on the most substantive of the counts in Hiss' indictment?

Manifestly, one cannot here even summarize the mass of evidence marshaled in the book's nearly 400 pages and, as Ernst wrote, it is "the accumulation of evidence" which is most convincing. Bearing these severe limitations in mind, I shall briefly indicate some of the main points conclusively demonstrated in *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss*.

1) Chambers originally swore that he personally knew that Alger and Donald Hiss were Communists because for a period of three years they paid their party dues to him. On another occasion, Chambers altered this testimony, declaring that they paid dues to him two or three times. At the trials, however, hours were spent by the prosecution trying to link Hiss ideologically, if not organizationally, to the Communist Party, but there was not a whisper of dues payment either in Chambers' testimony or in the government's examination of Alger and Donald Hiss. The presumption is overwhelming that Chambers lied about this whole matter and that the government, knowing it, decided to drop it.

2) Chambers swore that Hiss began to turn unauthorized, secret documents over to him in 1934, when Hiss was attached to the staff of the Nye Munitions Investigating Committee of

the Senate. To substantiate this, he produced the alleged documents. Hiss replied that Chambers introduced himself as George Crosley, a free-lance writer desiring material on the Nye investigation, and that he, Hiss, gave him documents relating to the inquiry, as he was supposed to since his job was to handle the Committee's publicity—and that similar documents were dispensed to other writers. The defense established, as the Earl declares, that "the [Nye Committee] documents delivered to Chambers were not secret at all, but were just those documents which would have been delivered to any journalist who was sufficiently interested to ask for them." Thus, in one specific instance of alleged secret document transmission, Chambers was shown to have lied.

3) In 1948 Chambers swore that Hiss was not engaged in espionage. In 1949 he swore that he was. He certainly, then, lied once. And his first denial was not based on a desire to protect Hiss—as Chambers indicated in 1949—because when he testified that Hiss was not engaged in espionage, he added that his work was more "important" than that, for he was "messaging up" U.S. foreign policy.

4) Chambers insisted that Hiss knew him as "Carl", not as George Crosley, as Hiss testified. Chambers admitted using many aliases, but said he could not remember using the name Crosely. Yet, as the defense showed, this would have meant that for several years Hiss knew this man only by a Christian name and introduced him this way to friends, hardly a likely situation. The matter is important, for if what Chambers says about the name is true, then the relationship between the two men from the start was most strange and irregular. The Earl Jowitt shows, from the record, that it is practically certain that in this regard too Chambers was lying*

5) Documentary evidence was submitted by the defense to show that Alger Hiss at times recommended and supported policies in the State Department which were contrary to those then supported by the Communist Party. The prosecution

* There was independent evidence unknown to the Earl that Chambers used the name George Crosley; we will return to this later.

dismissed this as deliberate camouflage on the part of Hiss! The Earl Jowitt finds this prosecution action far from convincing and thinks the defense documents in this regard go far to refute Chambers' description of Hiss.

6) Practically all of the specific and circumstantial testimony offered by Chambers, which physically could be checked (peculiarly much of it involved people out of the country, or dead, like Harry Dexter White), was shown to be false or highly dubious. This varied from alleged overnight stays at hotels, whose proprietors denied his presence, to markedly erroneous descriptions of apartments at which he swore he lodged, to conflicting testimony as to whether a so-called Colonel Bykov had one or two arms! In this connection, the Earl concludes: "... with Chambers the desire to embroider and embellish is so transcendent that I do not believe he knows when he is leaving the straight and narrow path of truth."

7) The famous documents produced by Chambers, the bulwark of the prosecution's case, passed through many hands in the State Department and could have been made available to Chambers by any number of other people.

8) The documents in Hiss' own handwriting, allegedly prepared for Chambers (what a careless spy!) were explained by Hiss as notes he prepared for his own guidance in day-to-day work and then threw into the waste-basket. These documents are abbreviated to the point of unintelligibility and contain nothing of a compromising nature. Hiss' explanation is logical, simple and complete.

9) The lengthy typed documents also are generally inconsequential in character and as a rule remarkably uninformative in terms of state "secrets."

10) The prosecution never explained why Hiss, or anyone else active in espionage, should have undertaken the tedious (and easily traceable) task of typing out lengthy documents when the work could have been done more accurately, and with less chance of implication, in the twinkling of a camera's shutter.

11) The Hiss typewriter, allegedly used to do the typing (this was agreed to during the trial by the defense) *could* have been used by other people—no special measures to safeguard it were taken.

12) The defense proved that Chambers was aware, and had been for years, of the tell-tale nature of typing and that he himself, therefore, had deliberately abandoned a typewriter in a public bus.

13) Two of the prosecution's most telling blows* against Hiss were "sprung" on him at the end of the trial when there was neither time nor opportunity for rebuttal. One was last-minute testimony of a domestic worker, who swore that she had worked for Chambers and that Hiss had visited his home—the *only* evidence of the allegedly close personal relations between Chambers and Hiss that the Government was able to produce. Another was Prosecutor Murphy's suggestion in his closing speech to the jury that the typing of the pertinent documents showed the same characteristics as the normal typing of Mrs. Hiss. There had been no testimony to this effect during the trial and its introduction in this manner was highly prejudicial, but it is clear that it weighed heavily with the jury. It was so flagrant a violation of proper procedure that it evokes mild words of criticism from the very restrained Earl.

Before turning to the weaknesses and omissions of the volume, it is important to emphasize that its author does not assert his belief in Hiss' innocence. Rather he insists that his guilt was not proven. What is it that keeps the Earl from expressing a belief in Hiss' innocence? It is that which "stumped" both the defense counsel and the defendant himself; it is that which was most heavily emphasized by the prosecution in charging guilt, and by the Appeals Court in rejecting Hiss' plea.

Hiss, before being sentenced, said: "I am confident that

* Both were demolished in post-trial evidence, but the Earl does not consider this; it will be referred to later.

in the future the full facts of how Whittaker Chambers was able to carry out forgery by typewriter will be disclosed." Stated in a neutral way by the Earl, the problem is this:

"The information which he [Hiss] was said to have handed over consisted in part of documents which had been typed on his own typewriter. Who typed them? If, as the prosecution asserted, they had been typed by Hiss or his wife, then I see no escape from the conclusion that Hiss was guilty. The only other possible view is that in some way or other Whittaker Chambers or his agents got access to the typewriter and manufactured a case against Hiss by typing on that typewriter documents which had been previously stolen from the State Department."

The Circuit Court of Appeals, rejecting Hiss' plea, similarly saw either the guilt of Hiss or, as "the only possible alternative," a colossal frameup engineered by Chambers, involving the extended use of "that particular typewriter . . . unknown to Mr. and Mrs. Hiss."

What is the failing? What is it that Hiss did not see, his defense counsel did not understand, the Court of Appeals ignored and the Earl Jowitt never poses? The answer is clear: *Hiss was not framed by Chambers*. Chambers was the vicious and willing tool, but *Hiss was framed by the ruling class of the United States and by its apparatus, most particularly by J. Edgar Hoover's F.B.I.**

It was not Chambers versus Hiss. For once the technical jargon of the law approached reality; it was the U.S.A. versus Hiss, *i.e.*, the rulers of the U.S.A., and here, specifically, the Department of Justice. It was the Cold War F.B.I. bringing Hiss—symbolizing the New Deal—before Cold War Grand Juries to be indicted, before Cold War blue-ribbon juries to be convicted, and before Cold War judges to be sentenced.

This explains Chambers' delay in publicly attacking Hiss; it explains Chambers' changing the basic accusation against Hiss; it explains how it happened that the F.B.I., with its scores of investigators "could not find" the supposed Hiss typewriter, while Hiss himself, through half a dozen inquiries,

* By the way, included in the British edition but cut out of the American edition of the Earl's volume was a sentence criticizing the "over-zealousness" of the F.B.I.

which "happened" to be fruitful, was himself able to find what he thought was his typewriter, sitting there all by itself in a Washington junk-yard, and so could himself give it to a "grateful" government!

The Earl Jowitt, with his ruling class approach, and his infinite care not to criticize any official's conduct,* and his political illiteracy which leads him to consider Communism a beard-and-bomb spectre, could not conceive of such an "alternative". Therefore, though in this volume he collates enough weaknesses in the government's case to convince himself and even Morris Ernst of the injustice of the verdict, he omits much more evidence that absolutely exposes the frameup of Alger Hiss by the so-called Department of Justice.

Most (not all) of this additional and conclusive evidence is in the motion for a new trial filed by Hiss' attorneys in January, 1952—and summarily rejected by the Court in February, 1952, and thoroughly concealed by the commercial press. This evidence, then, was printed five months prior to publication of Chambers' *Witness*, which the Earl Jowitt used, but not a word of the evidence or even of its existence is in the Earl's volume.

What evidence of the frameup of Alger Hiss, in addition to that assembled by the Earl Jowitt and briefly catalogued above, exists today?

1) At least one person other than Mr. and Mrs. Hiss has declared that he knew Whittaker Chambers as George Crosley. This is one Samuel Roth, publisher of the Seven Sirens Press in New York, who declares that Crosley (Chambers) tried to get Roth to publish a group of his poems. The poems seem to have been pornographic, and Roth himself has been convicted four times for distributing salacious literature, which may account for the defense's failure to call him as one of its witnesses.**

* Sharp and specific criticism of the government's conduct of the Hiss trials will be found in the last chapter of Richard B. Morris' *Fair Trial*, published last year by Knopf.

** Mr. Roth's story appeared in the New York Sun, Aug. 27, 1948. It is summarized by R. B. Morris, cited work, p. 434.

2) Chambers swore that the incriminating documents had all been kept for over ten years in an envelope hidden in a dumbwaiter in a Brooklyn apartment. In a post-trial affidavit, however, a leading testing and analysis expert, Daniel P. Norman, states that the papers show such different characteristics of aging "that they cannot have been stored together for ten years in a single envelope," and further that the envelope offered by Chambers could not possibly have held any of the documents for such a length of time.

3) In a post-trial affidavit, an F.B.I. expert stated that in copying work such as that involved in the documents, it is not possible to identify the typist by peculiarities in typing (reported by C. A. Wright, in *The Nation*, July 18, 1953). Other experts swear that the documents were not typed by one person, thus knocking into a cocked hat the prosecution's suggestion to the jury that peculiarities in the typing showed Mrs. Hiss to have been the typist.

4) The testimony of the carefully rehearsed final witness, "sprung" by the prosecution, tending to show repeated social calls by the Hisses at the Chambers' home, was completely demolished by affidavits from two different people that the witness was not and could not have been employed where and when she testified.

5) Chambers first swore—before the House Committee—that he left the Communist Party in 1937. In his last appearance before the Committee he modified this and said he left in "1937 or the beginning of 1938." But at the second Hiss trial he changed his testimony again, now swearing that he left the Party on April 15, 1938. The necessity and significance of the shift becomes obvious when it is known that one of the documents allegedly turned over to Chambers by Hiss did not reach the State Department until April 1, 1938. Unfortunately for Chambers, having changed his story, he was moved to offer circumstantial details. He testified that one month after leaving the Party—that is, about mid-May, 1938—he was employed by the Oxford University Press as a translator. The papers of that firm have now been examined.

Correspondence discloses that Chambers did claim to have broken from the Party and to be in fear of assassination, but they also clearly show that Chambers, having left the Party, was employed as a translator by Oxford University Press *no later than the middle of March, 1938*, and so, by his own testimony could not have been given by Hiss a State Department document dated April 1, 1938.

6) Was it possible, if one had manuscripts typed on a particular typewriter, to produce another typewriter whose impressions would be identical, or nearly identical, so that an expert could not tell which typewriter produced which document? If that could be done, it would fatally undermine the certainty with which the government's expert had identified the alleged typewriter as the instrument which had done the typing of the State Department documents held by Chambers. Well, it was done and the man who did it is a typewriter expert, Martin K. Tytell.

Typing from his constructed typewriter was submitted, together with photostats of the trial documents, to Miss Elizabeth McCarthy, document expert for the Boston Police and the Massachusetts State Police. She reported in an affidavit that the duplication was so close "that an expert in the field, however highly qualified, would find it difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between samples from the two machines." Therefore, she concluded, the testimony of the government's expert at the Hiss trial, identifying the Hiss typewriter as the only one that *could* have produced the trial documents, "is absolutely worthless." These findings were substantiated independently in an affidavit submitted by Mrs. Evelyn S. Ehrlich, another nationally recognized expert in the technical examination of prints and typography.

7) Mrs. Ehrlich also reported something else and put her findings in affidavit form. Defense counsel submitted to her personal letters unquestionably typed on the Hiss typewriter back in the thirties when the machine was still in the house, together with photostats of the trial documents allegedly typed on that same typewriter (a "fact" agreed to by the

defense during trial). Mrs. Ehrlich found substantial differences in these manuscripts and declared: "On the basis of this comparison, it is my opinion that it is entirely possible *that the so-called Hiss machine . . . is not the machine which was used to type the Hiss standard*" (i.e., the personal letters).

Further inquiry, reaching back a generation to the builder and distributor of the typewriters (plural, now!) involved, showed that the so-called Hiss machine—the exhibit at the trial—was almost certainly a fraud. This inquiry showed that its carriage was built in one year, its type face in another and then altered (even as Mr. Tytell had done, experimentally) to produce typing sufficiently like that of the genuine Hiss machine to easily fool an expert. At this point, however, affidavits were not forthcoming and that brings us to another stage in the Alger Hiss frameup.

That stage is open intimidation of defense counsel by the F.B.I. This is reported and spelled out in detail in the motion for a new trial submitted January 25, 1952 by Beer, Richards, Lane & Haller, attorneys for the defendant. There is not the space to quote in full the details and circumstances of this intimidation, but the defense attorneys reported that it became most intense as they concentrated on investigating the typewriter aspects of the deal. Here is their summary of this phase of their investigation:

"We search for records—the F.B.I. has them—we ask questions—the F.B.I. will not let people talk to us. We request access to ordinary documents in corporate files—corporate officials fear the wrath of their stockholders. We ask people to certify information in files they have shown us—they must consult counsel, and we hear no more from them. . . .

"And, even worse, honorable and patriotic citizens who have wanted to help have been deterred by the appearance—whether or not it is reality—of official surveillance and wire-tapping, and others who have labored to gather information for us in the interests of justice are afraid to come forward for fear of personal consequences which might result to them from public association with the defense of Alger Hiss."

One further comment on the typewriter angle. Wherever the defense went they found the F.B.I. had already been there. And when a defense investigator went to the old Woodstock Typewriter factory in Illinois seeking information on the type used in the Hiss typewriter, the factory manager remarked that his company "had helped the F.B.I. find the typewriter in the Hiss case." It will be remembered that a remarkable circumstance in the Hiss case, so far as the public knew, was that the F.B.I. could not find the typewriter, but that the defendant himself somehow managed to come upon it.

Would the F.B.I., would the Department of Justice commit so gross a frameup? One can answer: Yes, they would, because in the past they have. If one wishes to ignore the Rosenberg case as still "controversial," and all the Smith Act cases as also "controversial," and the Du Bois case as inconclusive since the defendants gained an acquittal, what shall he say of the Sacco-Vanzetti case? The same Department of Justice, the same F.B.I., indeed, the same Mr. Hoover. And in the Sacco-Vanzetti case did not two former F.B.I. men issue affidavits swearing that to their own personal knowledge the defendants "had nothing whatever to do with the South Braintree murder," and that "their conviction was the result of cooperation between the Boston Agents of the Department of Justice and the District Attorney?"* For further tidbits on the frameups, brutalities and lawlessness of "your F.B.I." I urge a reading of Max Lowenthal's already-hard-to-get *The Federal Bureau of Investigation* (William Sloane, N.Y., 1950).

The fact is that the American police are notorious for frameups, especially where some political element is present—as with Negroes, strikers, labor-leaders, Left-wingers. And the F.B.I. is king-pin of the American police. Moreover, this ruling class, whose police has traditionally resorted to the frameup (an American word), today in its advanced imperial-

* Osmond K. Fraenkel, *The Sacco-Vanzetti Case* (N. Y., 1931) pp. 126-29.

ist stage finds itself compelled to resort to frameups more regularly than ever before.

And Chambers? Is Chambers capable of playing such a role? Says Merle Miller who insists on Hiss' guilt and dismisses the Jowitt volume: "Of course, Chambers was the villain; he has not only confessed to that; he has publicly wallowed in his infamies" (*New Republic*, Aug. 3, 1953).

Somewhat later, Miller, defending his inane and cowardly review from the attacks of several *New Republic* readers, wrote: "... the sooner we stop trying to find excuses for him [Hiss], the sooner we can get down to our real business, one of the main aspects of which is, at the moment, to fight Joe McCarthy" (Aug. 24).

One speaks of a man falsely convicted, and Miller speaks of "finding excuses." Hiding injustices concocted by McCarthyism will not help defeat Joe McCarthy. The Hiss case is the major symbol of a key strategy of McCarthyism—to identify the liberalism and mild progressivism of the New Deal with "Communism".

The "Communism" in this fraudulent equation is itself a total lie, and the identification of such a monstrosity with the New Deal is also a complete lie. But scores of millions loved Roosevelt and that love remains a political force to be reckoned with. It is a love growing out of the masses' own rather idealized concept of Roosevelt and of the New Deal—of a man and a program that tried, and in considerable part succeeded, to give the "forgotten man"—the worker, the poor farmer, the Negro people, the masses—a "break".

Such images of humanism and decency, which move the masses to resist reaction, are anathema to McCarthyism. The frameup of Alger Hiss is one of the ways McCarthyism plans to wipe out these images and replace them with—fascism.

Exposure of the frameup of Alger Hiss is one of the last things McCarthy wants. It should be one of the main efforts of all who hate McCarthyism because such exposure rips to shreds the myth of the "Communist" New Deal, the whole tissue of Nazi-like lies and policies which is McCarthyism.

AUGUST, 1952

Taking the Stand

SOME THINGS ONE NEVER FORGETS. WALKING, FOR EXAMPLE, AT two in the morning with Steve Nelson in the Hill district of Pittsburgh, and Steve facing twenty years, and the steel mills' bearths blazing and Steve catching your arm and saying with passion and pride: "See it light up the whole sky! Look at the beauty and the power!"

Watching George Aloysius Meyers explain to an aged Federal judge in Baltimore why he, a worker and a Communist, could not be an informer though the judge threatened him with eternal imprisonment. "Judge," says Meyers, "on my first picket line all of us were taking turns except this one worker. He said he was staying on the line all the time. We told him to take his turn like everyone else, but he said no he was staying on. And we didn't press him too hard because we knew what was eating him—his father had scabbed once and the son was trying to live that down. I'm not putting that load on my kids, Your Honor, so I'm giving you no names, and you go ahead and give me jail."

Johnny Gates giving you his open, beautiful smile of comradeship; watching the marshal handcuff him and march twenty feet down a corridor (John still with that springy walk of his), enter the McCarran Board hearing-room, unlock the cuffs and then seat himself a dozen feet from his prisoner, and John testifying, after days of solitary confinement in a hot Washington cell and haggard from a year in Atlanta Penitentiary, to the truth and glory of his life, his belief, his Party. And hearing John Gates tell the Government lawyer, Paisley of Mississippi, who wants names: "If you are looking

TAKING THE STAND

239

for stoolpigeons, Mr. Paisley, apply to J. Edgar Hoover. He is the keeper of the rats. You could lynch me legally, Justice Department style, or you could lynch me Mississippi style, and you still wouldn't get such information from me."

There is much about those McCarran Board hearings that requires telling and one day, I suppose, it will all be told. Right now there are just a few points I'd like to make.

Those hearings resulted from the passage of the McCarran Act. That Act, fathered by Franco's favorite Senator, says that Marxism-Leninism is the theory and practice of forcibly overthrowing governments in general and the United States government in particular and that the Communist Party is the agency dedicated to this purpose and that it is guided and directed in achieving this aim by the Soviet Union. Therefore, says the Act, all Communists are, in fact, agents of the U.S.S.R., and Communists in the United States have repudiated their allegiance to their country and are really traitors, espionage agents, fiends incarnate. That is, the Act says what Mussolini, Hitler and Hearst said in their wildest moments. If the McCarran Act is true then those three unlamented gentlemen were paragons of truth.

Congress finds all this to be a "fact," sets up a Board, tells it to investigate the "fact" and promises to pay the members \$15,000 annually to find the "fact," the finding of which has already moved Congress to set up the Board in the first place! And, says this insane law, after the Board "finds," as Congress "found," that Communists are, indeed, monstrous agents of chaos, murder and tyranny, they—the Communists—must duly register themselves as in "fact" what the Board and Congress "find" them to be! And if one does not so label himself, he is to go to prison for *ten years*—with every day's failure to register a *separate* offense! Then comes the turn of the "Communist-front" organizations—to infinity—to fascism.

Distinguished, certified-one-hundred-percent-pure Americans will, with the help of the Department of Justice, examine the

thought-processes of some representative, live Communists—one out of a prison-cell, another out of a court room where she is battling to stay out of prison, and the third from an editorial desk. All this after listening, for fourteen months, to twenty-five informers and government agents.

And upon what rested the Government's position? Fierce malevolence compounded by stupendous ignorance.

The ignorance is exemplified in the official recording which certainly did no injustice to the intellectual equipment of the prosecuting personnel. The ancient *poet*, Terence, became the *ancient proletariat*; Lenin's *mastery* of Marxism became his *massacre* of Marxism; imperialism, the stage of *moribund* capitalism became the stage of *more abundant* capitalism; Lord Bryce who seventy years ago characterized the Republican and Democratic parties as Tweedledee and Tweedledum, became Lord Christ; *dialectical materialism* became *direct imperialism*.

At times this created serious difficulty. Thus, Mr. Paisley demanded that Elizabeth Gurley Flynn give more details concerning the many street fights in which she had participated.

"Street fights?"

"Yes, street fights."

"What are you talking about? I've not been in street fights."

"So," said Paisley, sensing a significant victory, "did you not testify at page so-and-so of the transcript to your participation in many street fights?"

And, sure enough, so it was recorded and so it was understood and so it was argued—until finally the veteran battler for civil rights persuaded all and sundry that she had testified to taking part in *free speech* fights, not in *street* fights!

The same cultured gentleman began a phase of his examination of me in this way: "So you Communists don't believe in heroes?"

"What's that?"

"I say, you Communists don't believe in heroes?"

"Heroes?"

"Yes, heroes."

"I don't understand. I have many heroes."

Then, a light dawned and I remarked: "Oh, Mr. Paisley, you are thinking of my testimony in which I said that Marxists do not believe in the *hero concept* of history!" This delightful exchange concluded with the Justice Department's man petulantly wanting to know what was the difference anyway.

Prevarication, with malice aforethought, was also very much present. Mr. Taylor—the Government's "theoretician," mis-educated at Harvard—feigned shock, for example, when upon asking whether the Soviet Union did not have a dictatorship of the Communist Party, he was answered in the negative. With a flourish he demanded Government's exhibit such-and-such, which was not a pistol, nor a mink coat, but simply a paperbound book entitled *Problems of Leninism* by Joseph Stalin.

He then read from page 54 of that work as follows: "Who gives effect to the power of the working class? The Communist Party! In this sense, we have *the dictatorship of the Party*."

Of course, anyone glancing at the volume will immediately see that those words are from the traitor Zinoviev; that Stalin is quoting them; that he is quoting them in the course of arguing *against* this position—the position of Trotsky—and that Stalin and Lenin held this position to be, as they said, "impermissible." Anyone examining this work will see that its whole Section V, and especially pages 50-59, are devoted to demolishing this concept of the Party and of the Soviet Union.

No, Stalin says there, it is not a dictatorship of the Party, but of the working class, and those who speak otherwise "are wrong from the point of view of Leninism, for they thereby violate the conditions of the correct relations between the vanguard and the class." Recall, says Stalin, "Lenin's golden words" that "Among the masses of the people we [Communists] are but drops in the ocean and we will be able to

govern only when we properly express that which the people appreciate." And Stalin quotes these words again, putting them in italics, "*Properly express that which the people appreciate,*" and then concludes: "This is precisely the necessary condition that ensures for the Party the honorable role of the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Mr. Taylor's fabrication was and is important to the Government, for the McCarran Act "finds" the U.S.S.R. to be a "dictatorship" of the Communist Party. It is important for the Government to maintain the fabrication because its refutation shows the profoundly democratic content of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party's organic ties to the masses, and the Marxist-Leninist concept of leadership as springing from, tied to and nourished by those masses.

Most revealing, however, was the exposure of the prosecution's morality by their own questions. Thus, Mr. Paisley demanded of John Gates: "Who said, 'if we don't hang together, we'll hang separately?'"

"Benjamin Franklin."

"Well, Mr. Gates, don't you think that your five-year sentence, then, was mild punishment?"

John told him off, fiercely—the gall of the question, its callousness, its false assumption of evil-doing. And—was the representative of the United States Government taking sides with Benjamin Franklin—or with King George the Third!

And the government insisted that "you Communists" just use the Negro people and make propaganda of their so-called grievances in order to embarrass and weaken the United States, wasn't that right?

No, it was not right, and the "grievances" were in fact a veritable crucifixion of a people for over three hundred years and much of the wealth of the rulers of this country was based on that crucifixion and there was nothing "so-called" about it. And only a bigoted brain could conceive

of anybody "using" the Negro people. Nobody "used" Frederick Douglass and nobody "uses" Benjamin Davis or Claudia Jones or the Negro people.

The idea can only come from a brain poisoned by white supremacy, by a brain, Mr. Paisley, that looks upon the Negro people as inferior. And it reflects, too, a terrible class snobishness and arrogance, this whole idea of "using" people. Communists don't think that way. Communists don't think of people, of any people, as sheep to be led around by the nose. Communists don't look upon people as apathetic and stupid. Maybe the present Government of the United States, as represented by you, Mr. Paisley, does, but that's their mistake and your mistake.

Furthermore, the Communist Party is a Party of Negro people and of white people, of all kinds of people of all kinds of backgrounds. And the Negro members are full members, not half or quarter members and they have all the rights and duties of any other member.

And the thorns upon the Negro's head has drawn blood from America's body. We Communists know that. We know that the special oppression of the Negro people fattens up the bosses, divides and weakens the workers, lowers wages, is eating out the vitals of our country. Therefore Communists, Negro and white together, fight for the freedom of the Negro people because first of all they should be free and because until they are free the working class and the farmers and the vast majority of the American people generally cannot be and will not be free.

Mr. Government-lawyer, do you understand that?

This same Mr. Paisley asked Elizabeth Gurley Flynn if it were not a fact that Communists support the steel workers in their strike because it hurts the "defense" effort of the United States and "helps" the Soviet Union.

No, said the Communist leader, eyes flashing. We are a working-class Party and so we support the just demands of the working people. And when you talk of a "defense" effort you are really talking about a huge war-making effort and

it's to protect that effort that you are persecuting Communists who want peace, not war. And nothing that strengthens the working class can hurt the real defense of this country. On the contrary, strengthening the working class strengthens the country. And there's no question of "helping" the Soviet Union here. The question is gaining the elementary rights of the steel workers and protecting the organized trade-union movement.

At this point Vito Marcantonio and John Abt, the courageous lawyers defending the Party before the Board, added that Mr. Paisley's question showed precisely the logic of the McCarran Act, for, by the terms of that Act and by his reasoning, the United Steelworkers Union-C.I.O. should be forced to register as agents of the "World Communist Movement" since it was "aiding" the Soviet Union!

The government, however, hit hardest at earnings. How much money have you made? That was the main question for them. Do you have a car? How many rooms in your apartment? Is it an elevator apartment? How much were you paid to fight Franco? What's your salary? How much royalties do you get? What does the Jefferson School pay you?

The answers, pointing, of course, to what the Government incredulously called "meager" earnings, visibly shook Mr. Paisley. He thought everyone—not only his own colleagues, but everyone—was like Mr. Paisley.

The simplest answers were the most difficult for the Government men to believe. Faced by Gurley Flynn's bell-like clarity and transparently open sincerity, they were helpless. This is right, this is just, this is true, this is against decency, this is unprincipled—such ideas are what most disturbed these lost souls.

Thus, "international solidarity" sounded sinister to the Government. What is it? The feeling of fraternity, of comradeship, of kinship. The feeling of common interests, of universal aspirations. For instance, Dimitrov stands up to

the Nazis in their own court, exposes them for the criminals they were, to their face. What did I get from Dimitrov? Courage, strength, inspiration—international solidarity. How can a police mind understand this?

Towards the end of the hearings Mr. Paisley demanded: "So you think you can change human nature?" To what, to the monstrosity pictured in the McCarran Act? No, he meant, he said: "Do you really believe you can ever end man's inhumanity to man? Ever end greed, envy, jealousy?"

What irony! Because we did believe this we were traitors! And Mr. Paisley knew that we Communists believed affirmatively and passionately on these matters. Indeed, he really knew in his own twisted way and his questions proved it, that it was because Communists mean to help end inhumanity, eliminate greed and hate and envy, and rule by the greedy and envious and hateful, that it was *because* of this that Communists are the first to be attacked and persecuted by the bosses and their servitors.

Really, it was obscene to see a Paisley question the integrity and patriotism of a John Gates and an Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, whose lives are poems of dedication to the noblest aspirations of humanity. But in a deeper sense it was reassuring. For Paisley, spokesman for imperialism, chauvinism and obscurantism, was, though clothed with brief authority, the uncertain weakling, and the prisoner and his indicted comrade were the firm, strong, uncompromising partisans of peace and creativity—the sure heralds of a noble American future.

We believe even Mr. Paisley and his finely-tailored Harvard associate, sensed something of this by the time the McCarran hearings closed. Indeed, one of the numerous Government staff remarked, privately, to one on the opposite side: "I think, maybe, in twenty-five years, I might come up to you and say, 'Well, you guys were right.'"

It may take him twenty-five years, but it is going to take the vast majority of the American people a great deal less time than that.

APRIL, 1955

The Informer System and Justice

BISMARCK, A CHARTER MEMBER OF THE RED-BAITER'S INTERNATIONAL racket, knew a thing or two about informers and police spies, since these were important to his benign administration of Prussia. He had his troubles with them, however, as he explained to his wife in unburdening what passed for his heart. He wrote to her:

Owing to lack of material, police agents lie and exaggerate outrageously. . . . Bad characters among them—good characters do not accept such posts—naturally hit upon the idea that if other people will not attempt any crimes, they must be helped. For if it is impossible for them to report that something is doing, they become superfluous, and of course no one wants to be superfluous. So they help out, "correcting fortune," as the French adage has it.

Characteristic of the ruling-class arrogance and amorality in this passage is the assumption that the agents are "bad" while its author remains—Prince Bismarck. Of course, it was his policy of reactionary terror at home and violent aggressiveness abroad that necessitated, among other things, the use of stool-pigeons and informers to spread panic and confusion, and to "justify" the jailing of those patriots who opposed his ruinous program. The procurer is contemptuous of the prostitute.

Something like this is happening today in our country as the rot surrounding the whole informer framework is being uncovered. For example, *Time Magazine* (Feb. 14, 1955), commenting on Harvey Matusow's *False Witness*,* tells its

* Published by Cameron & Kahn, N. Y.

readers that, "The F.B.I. has known for years that Matusow was a squalid liar," and, "The F.B.I. now says that it dropped him in 1950."

Of course, the F.B.I. knew that Matusow "was a squalid liar"—that is why it employed him. And it is lying again, perhaps out of sheerest habit, when it says that it "dropped him in 1950." It is since 1950 that the F.B.I. really used Matusow. Just last year, in the frameup of Clinton Jencks of the Mine-Mill Union, and in the SACB farce involving the Labor Youth League, his lying testimony was crucial. And above all, his perjuries ran through 700 pages of testimony in the 1952 Smith Act trial that resulted in the jailing of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Pettis Perry and their eleven co-defendants.

In Matusow's triumphant days, when he was a squalid liar and a sneaking stool-pigeon, he was Big Business' Model American Youth. He was loud and glib and boastful; merciless and cynical and greedy; wily and ignorant and uncouth. He was the Success Kid, fit friend for Roy Cohn and Howard Rushmore and George Sokolsky; he was "A Great American" as the very greatest American, Senator McCarthy, assured him, in writing; he was the Mickey Spillane of the witness stand, the Glamor Boy of the witch-hunting circuit.

And he didn't only make the night-club circuit with Roy and his "girl friends," and he didn't only get stinking drunk with Low-Blow Joe. No, sir; he was a consultant for the United States Department of Justice (if Wilson's Department is of Defense, then Brownell's is of Justice), and for the *New York Times*. His expert opinion was sought out by the President of Queens College who made a special trip to visit the young savant in his home; he guided the views and acts of the Superintendent of Education of New York City and of his chief investigator; he aided the Police Commissioner of the same city; he was personally greeted by the Governor of Wisconsin.

Principals of high schools vied with each other to get him to address their student bodies; radio stations offered him time; television companies proudly brought his visage to millions of homes; the Hearst chain serialized his sterling contributions in newspapers also reaching millions; the American Legion paid him hundreds of dollars to write and speak for veterans; he became one of the censors of American culture helping to determine which artists were pure enough to perform. He helped smear and ruin and impoverish and jail men and women so far his superiors that he was not worthy to pare their toenails. And all this as a lackey of a ruling class set on the path of fascism and of world war.

Some of the sordid details of this American Success Story are in his *False Witness*. Every page records some "minor" infraction of law and decency. Telephones tapped; the postal franking privilege violated; executive session material deliberately "leaked" to the press; money meant for the anti-Communist "crusade" used to speculate in soybeans; the subpoena powers of Senatorial Committees flouted and witnesses spirited out of the country; friendly witnesses being examined in closed sessions by Senatorial committees and, "After each question was asked, we stopped and had an off-the-record discussion about what the best answer would be."

But behind it all a policy of fascism and war; behind it all the State apparatus, the courts, the prosecutors, the police, the politicians, the whole gamut of ultra-respectability with malice aforethought using venomous creatures and filthy means to whip up an anti-Communist hysteria, an anti-Soviet hysteria—a paralysis of mind and nerve, the better to put over the destruction of the Bill of Rights and the launching of atomic war.

The central means—the Big Lie of Hitler. And then, jail the Communists, smash the organized labor movement, discredit the New Deal traditions, identify dissent with treason and finally—Heil!

"I had to relive every experience I had had as a Communist—taking innocent remarks and events and making them sound

properly sinister." And with the help of the Justice Department he did the twisting, and in this book he spells out the exact nature of the lies he told that were so important in sending to jail Communists and others and forcing teachers and workers to lose their jobs.

In his general stool-pigeon activity and his "witnessing" he was, he writes, "in constant touch with management." He worked in closest contact with General Electric and the Texas & Pacific Railroad, with major department stores, broadcasting concerns, publishing houses, aircraft firms. One of his buddies and "contacts" was a Colonel Warner, head of Ohio's Civil Defense, who quite conveniently also conducted a private investigation organization whose "services are sold to plants and business concerns not only in Ohio but throughout the United States." Another was a retired Colonel Amos who lived in Washington, worked hand-in-glove with McCarthy and "had a private spy network throughout Europe," and of whom he, Matusow, had heard "that one of Beria's agents was in direct contact with him."

This is his story and *this* story is substantiated with dozens of affidavits and photostats of pertinent documents ranging from Army orders to letters, telegrams, subpoenas, quotations from court and committee records. *This story* (and one feels that Matusow has still told only a fraction of what he knows) is substantiated not only by the documentation that would convince any inquiring brain, but also detailed and consistent and credible circumstantial evidence. Moreover, fundamentally, this story is substantiated by the way in which it coincides with what has been happening in our country; it fits into and helps fill out the whole scheme of contemporary American history.

Communists have *known* that *all* the stool-pigeons, not only Matusow, were liars and that the whole Smith Act prosecution was a monstrous fabrication from beginning to end. They knew their Comrades who have been jailed and arrested and they knew, as they know the faces of their children, that the whole anti-Communist campaign was and is a complete

frameup in every detail and in its entirety. But others who do not have the advantages of Communists will be helped to see something of it by this volume—an historic contribution to unmasking the nature of the administration of justice today under Attorney General Brownell. Above all, they will be helped to see, that while the Communists have been the first victims of the reactionary terror, it actually aims at every liberty and right that Americans have won, that it aims at the labor unions, at the Negro people, at elementary democracy—at worldwide war.

Something of this impact is already evident in the response that the book has evoked. Even the *New Leader* was able to squeeze out of a long "psychoanalytic" inquiry into "why Matusow did it," this line: "If we have sent people to jail on perjured evidence, that fact is important to all of us!"

Others have done much better. Notable was the reaction of Barry Gray, a syndicated columnist and TV commentator. He found Matusow's book to be "a shocking exposé of the weaknesses of our investigative system." And he went so far as to raise serious and valid demands:

Open the Matusow file with an investigation of investigations. Examine the blacklist technique. Cross-examine every individual mentioned in his book. Let us properly allocate some of the blame—what we have left after draping it on ourselves.

Murray Kempton, in his *New York Post* column, responded even more sharply. The Matusow book leads him to write that the Smith Act trials were based upon an idea that "was nonsense on its face" and that therefore, to convict Communists it was necessary "to substitute a malignant fantasy for reality." He says that the fantasy was concocted not by Matusow but by "Harry Truman and J. Edgar Hoover." He calls for an awakening from the witch-hunting drug.

Especially noteworthy was the *New York Times'* editorial denunciation of the Justice Department's attempt to ascribe the widespread opposition to the informer system to a "Communist effort." The *Times*, after some Communist-baiting

of its own, nevertheless goes on in the strongest terms to excoriate the Department for seeking in this way to silence accumulating protests against its "repeated use of totally unreliable paid professional informers."

The increasing anti-McCarthy mass pressures, the manifestly growing popular discontent with the Big Business policy of repression, is of course basic to the production of such an editorial and to such columns as those which Messrs. Gray and Kempton are now writing. Similarly, these pressures are the basic causes of the retractions of a Matusow and of a Marie Natvig and Lowell Watson, and those to follow.

To seek out individual motivations for a book like *False Witness* is probably illusory and is in any case, irrelevant to its historic meaning. The book reflects the wholesale perversion of justice where a ruling class drives towards fascism; that its author chose to make those revelations and that they finally found publishers and that the book is now reaching tens of thousands of people, despite frantic efforts by the F.B.I. to kill it, is likewise testimony to the developing opportunities in our country to really rout McCarthyism.

In his volume, Matusow tells how upsetting to him, during the 1952 Smith Act trials, were the faces of the defendants, for as he sat there swearing to lie after lie at the government's prodding he knew that they knew that he was lying. He remarks especially the hatred and the contempt in the eyes of Claudia Jones.

Claudia Jones, at the time, before being sentenced, told the Court:

You will no doubt choose as the basis for sentence the concocted lies which flowed so smoothly from the well-paid tongues of stool-pigeons and informers who paraded before you here and gave so-called evidence which the Court has asserted was "amply justified."

"Amply justified," your Honor? What has been amply justified? The lies of degenerate witnesses . . . "Amply justified"! Indeed! This "evidence"!

And Eugene Dennis, in his summation to the jury at the 1949 Smith Act trials, put his finger on the whole meaning

and significance of lying stool-pigeon "evidence." He said, in this magnificent speech that deserves to be studied and re-studied:

The jury might draw some conclusions of its own from the prosecution's false witnesses, who testified that they covenanted with the prosecution for thirty pieces of silver, and from that time sought opportunity to betray their trade-union brothers, their own blood relatives, the family next door.

They testified that they were employed by the F.B.I., which schooled them to ply their sordid tale of falsification, provocation, and disruption. They confessed—nay, boasted—that they are without shame and scruple.

Thus the prosecution's false witnesses inadvertently proved the Marxist thesis that end and means are inter-related and inseparable. They proved that the despicable conspiratorial methods adopted by the prosecution in its desperate attempt to convict the defendants are as un-American as they are sinister.

The fact is that the only conspiracy which has been proved in this trial is that to which the prosecution and its false witnesses are party—the bipartisan conspiracy to destroy the Bill of Rights and peace.

Matusow's book, *False Witness*, lifts just a little the covering over the sewer that is the Department of Justice and the F.B.I. That for this, and for his belated efforts to undo some of the terrible harm he has brought about, he should now have been sentenced, by an arm of that Department, to a three-year prison term, is rather ironic confirmation of the filth in that sewer.

This scandalous reaction by the Department of Justice, of compounding injustice—jailing its stoolpigeons for confessing their perjuries, and jailing them for the confessions, not for the perjuries!—is indicative of the especially foul nature of that Department after ten years of Cold War and hot reaction. It shows further that to secure elementary justice today, exposure is but the beginning; exposure must be accompanied by and followed up with the broadest possible mass pressure to clean up the stench in the Brownell stable.

FEBRUARY, 1955

Two Hangings on Guam

IT IS 9:22 IN THE MORNING OF JANUARY 27, 1954. AN ARMORED truck stops twenty yards from a newly-erected scaffold near a hangar at the Northwest Military Air Field on the Pacific island of Guam. Armed guards dot the area. A Negro man, 24 years old, climbs out of the truck and walks, with firm tread, to the gallows, mounts its seventeen steps and, directing his remarks to assembled newsmen, says:

"They are making a big mistake and they are not accomplishing anything by executing me. Even after the execution, if they find the guilty parties, I do not hold in my heart anything against them. But I pray forgiveness for them and I pray for those who are making this mistake."

The executioner offers to strap him to a body support. He rejects it and turns to the minister. "Please read the 23rd Psalm," he says. Over his head is placed a black hood; sounds issue from it as though he is still seeking to speak. As the trap is sprung the minister is reading, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." It is 9:30; at 9:45 the 24-year old is quite still. A doctor pronounces him dead.

Ten minutes later another truck appears. This vehicle, balking at its task, has broken down and is pushed onto the scene by an ambulance. Soon this ambulance will haul the corpse of him who now jumps out of the truck.

A 36-year old Negro man, this time. He, too, walks firmly up the gallows steps, and also rejects the body support. The officer in charge is nervous: four times his prisoner has tried to escape. Confidentially, the officer tells a reporter: "He is a brute."

The "brute" does not ask for prayers. He turns to the apprehensive officer and says, so that all may hear: "You are just complying with an order, sir. You have not solved the crime." The hood is fastened. It is 10:08; the trap is sprung. At 10:25 the body is still—its breath is gone, its neck is broken. A doctor pronounces him quite dead. The body is removed. All is in order.

Five years before, in January, 1949, these two men—Pvt. Herman P. Dennis, Jr., the first to hang, and S/Sgt. Robert W. Burns—and a third Negro member of an Air Force service outfit, Pvt. Calvin Dennis, were arrested, separately, by the Guam police—that is, by Marines, since Guam was administered by the Navy. Each was accused of participating in the rape-murder, a month before, of a young white woman, Ruth Farnsworth, a clerk in a curio store, The Jade Shop.

The men were questioned individually. The question period lasted from five to ten days. During this time each was held incommunicado. None was told of his rights in terms of answering or not answering questions; none was told that anything he might say would be used against him in a trial. None was allowed to see counsel, or anyone else, except the questioners and certain "persuaders."

It is the jail in Agana, Guam. Lt. Commander James P. Hackett, U.S. Naval Reserve, Chief of Police, is present. So is Albert E. Riedel, Inspector of Police, Berkeley, California, called in as an expert consultant. For the rest, we turn to a letter written in 1949 by Calvin Dennis:

"I didn't know anything about this crime . . . I didn't know what it was all about. So this fellow named Hackett start asking me questions about the crime that happen on the 11th of Dec. 1948, I told him I don't know anything about no crime, until I saw it in the papers. Hackett ask me what I was doing that night. I told him I was driving the bus. He ask me have I any proof of that, I told him I have. Hackett said he didn't believe it. Hackett said I want you to tell me the truth, I said I've told you the truth sir.

I said if you don't believe me I will get proof.

"Hackett said he found a smock in my truck, and said it belong to the lady that got murdered and rape. Hackett ask me did I know anything about that, I told him no I don't no anything about it. Hackett said it was about 8 or 9 pieces of rags in the truck, and said he picked out the cleanest one. I told him I didn't check to see was any rags.

"Hackett said Calvin if you don't tell me the truth, he said he was going to pin murdered and rape on me. I told him I've told the truth & have proof he said be didn't believe a dam word of it.

"Hackett said he would make a promise of the \$4000 reward. I would get part of it if I would sign a statement. I told him I Don't know anything about a crime & I am not signing any statment. He said when be got through with me I would sign one. I wouldn't sign it.

"Hackett & Redell start beating and knocking on me from eight o'clock in the morning until three o'clock that afternoon. Hackett threaten to hang me, & forcing me to sign a statement, bending my arms, and all that, threw me in the cell for 16 hours without any water or food.

"The next day I was so sick and sore, I didn't know wether I was going or coming. Hackett & Redell come out there the next morning and ask me was I going to sign a statement. I told him, I know nothing to sign no statement for. Hackett & Redell starting beating on me again, calling me all kinds of names. I was sick and sore, I was crazy. I didn't know what I said, I didn't know what I was doing.

"I couldn't help myself. Hackett say if I play ball with him, he would see I got out in 30 days. He said if I didn't play ball with him, he would see I got the death sentence. Hackett show me a photo of a filipino where he got hung on Guam, he said if I didn't tell him something about the crime, that's the way I'll be hanging. He said every n----- he got hung, he would get a promotion . . .

"They had me so crazy after beating and forcing me, I didn't care what I said, and my mind was gone . . . I had proof for everything I did that nigbt. Tthey didn't believe the truth."

Calvin "confessed."

While Calvin Dennis rested, the preservers of law and order entertained Herman Dennis. "On the 8th of Jan. they began to question me. From that day through [to January 12] they

pounded questions after questions, even late one night (not referring to nights I was beaten)." They showed Herman Dennis the same gruesome photo they had showed Calvin. They told him that the other two had "fingered" him. They told him if he confessed and implicated the others he would get at most ten years and be free in maybe five and that he could pick his own job while in jail and he'd come out and he was then only 19, so look how young you would still be and will you sign a statement?

Between questioning came visits from three Marine guards.

"All they did was twist my arm behind my back and made a punching bag of my stomach and sides." Finally, on the fourth day: "I had only two choices, die or live—so I thought. I rather serve ten years than die, so I said what he told me to say."

Finally, Burns, a mess sergeant, 31 years old. He is arrested on January 10. He, too, is questioned. Commander Hackett wants to know where he was on December 11. He doesn't remember; it's a month ago. What did you eat for dinner on December 10 and December 11? He can't remember that—are these men crazy? What is it they want? Are they investigating a black market in food? I can't remember what I had for dinner three days ago and they want me to tell them what I had thirty days ago.

Riedel hooks him on to what he says is a lie-detector. Then he discovers it's about the rape-murder. He denies any knowledge of it. He is not then beaten, but is thrown into a shack with a pig, chickens, vermin, a cot and a mattress. The next day a paper is flung in to him. It's the *Guam News* reporting his "statement," under the banner head: GUAM KILLER CONFESSES.

Food is brought—the first in 24 hours. He is famished, but it is so foul that he flings it to the animal residents of his shack.

Then another visit with Messrs. Hackett and Riedel, with

three Marines standing by. Thirteen hours of persistent questioning, the two law officers relieving each other, interspersed with blows from the Marines. But Burns will sign nothing.

Then, in truth, "the rough stuff started; the floor of the room we were in was all that kept me from being beaten into the ground."

The Berkeley Inspector hits him with a wet broom. Two Marines work him over with rubber hoses; a third lambastes his face with fists covered by tightly-fitting gloves. Burns gets up, breaks loose, and fights back. He knocks the Lieutenant Commander down with a blow. Then all five are on him at once. Blows and kicks from all directions. He is knocked into insensibility.

When he awakens in a cell both eyes are swollen nearly closed, three teeth are missing, blood oozes from ears, mouth, nose; forehead and chin are bleeding. He is visited by a Marine. This one is friendly, most sympathetic. He wants to help, he regrets his troubles, tell him all about it; what really happened? Anyone can make a mistake. Burns reiterates his innocence. The friendly one turns on him with a leather thong and beats him.

Inspector Riedel and three Marines appear. They question him for 15 minutes, then beat him; then question him, then beat him. The sun sets, it is deep into the evening, and now: "I could no longer feel the beating, but could hear the blows, which sounded like they were off in a distance."

Then: "I heard water splashing and was soon aware of some one pouring water on my face. The room spun in a crazy whirl, then became clear."

Someone was talking to him; was it Hackett or Riedel? He didn't know, but then the words became clear: "Sign right here, boy, and everything will be all right."

They will kill me. How shall I stop them? I shall not sign, but how shall I stop them? I say: "If you bring me a priest I will talk." (I am not a Catholic, but maybe asking for a priest will get them to stop.)

It works. They send for a priest; they stop beating him.

The priest comes. What is it? he wants to know, and is especially puzzled when he hears that Burns is not a Catholic. Burns explains. The priest asks if he is innocent. Burns says he is, and the priest says in that case he is to hold out no matter what happens. Burns asks that the priest tell his outfit of his whereabouts and his predicament.

When the priest leaves, the police return. Burns says he will sign. They say that in that case he can have food. Coffee and sandwiches are brought him, and pencil and paper. Burns turns to eat—he is starving. No, not yet. First you write your confession; then you eat.

Sgt. Burns takes the pencil and he writes: "I, Sgt. Robert W. Burns, do confess complete innocence of the tragedy of Ruth Farnsworth."

Again, he is beaten until he is unconscious. He awakens on his cot: "I lay on my bed, tried to understand how such things were permitted in the military service of a civilized nation."

Two more days they work on him. He confesses nothing. He pieces together his whereabouts on December 11 and tells it to the tormenters in detail—names, hours, places. Every new detail earns a new blow. For two more days. Then they quit and allow him to see his commanding officer and his chaplain, first warning him to say nothing of his treatment. If he does, he will live, briefly, to regret it.

He tells them nothing, except that he is not guilty.

He is moved from his shack, to a cage—an actual cage used to transport animals. And this cage, with the United States Air Force Sergeant in it, is placed eight feet from the main road of Agana "where an enraged crowd shouted curses and threats in vile profanity." Then to a stockade, to await, with the two others, a trial.

The crime occurred on Saturday, December 11, 1948, at about 8:45 in the evening. Ruth Farnsworth was alone in the Jade Shop at that time, due to a conjunction of rather unusual events. First, another part-time clerk, Sue Blackledge, who would normally have been with her, had left at 7 p.m.

to go dancing. The manager of the store, one John W. Arnold, for reasons never made clear, was also absent. The night watchman came regularly at 9 p.m. (which was closing time) and remained until 7 the following morning.

At about 8:30 that evening, Miss Blackledge says she passed the shop on her way to the dance (a peculiar circumstance, for passing the shop meant going quite a bit out of the way in terms of reaching the dance-hall from her home—this, too, was never explained) and noticed that the lights were out. This was irregular for that hour; nevertheless, she did not go in and did not investigate, though why not is unclear.

At about the same time, two military police observed two Filipino soldiers leaving the shop, but they apparently noticed nothing unusual and did nothing. That same evening, somewhat earlier—the time was never pinpointed—a Mr. Moylan, operator of a drug store in the town of Agana—some 5 or 6 miles away—and his brother had been in the shop, and on leaving they saw two white men, civilians, enter, and they noticed a black civilian car parked outside. Neither the Filipino soldiers nor the white civilians were ever apprehended (nor does the record disclose that the police sought them) but the testimony as to their presence at the scene of the crime on the evening of its occurrence was never broken down by the prosecution.

At 9 p.m. the night watchman appeared, and turned up the light switch. The light did not go on (the wires had been torn out of the main switch in the rear of the store). The watchman struck a match, and saw some disorder in the place. He checked the cash register and found \$7,000 in it—there had been no robbery. (This extraordinary sum of cash, in a small curio shop, competing with a large Post Exchange just across the street, was never explained.)

The watchman then became aware of the absence of Miss Farnsworth. He left, but did not go across the street to the office of the Provost Marshal, where investigators and military police could be found. Rather he started to walk to the home of the manager, in Agana. He succeeded in getting a lift and

soon reached the manager. The manager and he went to the Agana jail and picked up Commander Hackett, in charge of the police force. The Commander took a Marine with him and the four men reached the shop at something like 9:35 or 9:40. Using flashlights the men searched about the store. They found several bobby pins on the floor, a lapel watch there, too, and a pair of women's shoes, widely separated, outside. After a few minutes of this—sometime before 10 p.m.—Commander Hackett suggested that the search be called off—indicating that it was late, and Saturday evening, and things could wait.

A searching party appeared on the morning of Monday, December 13 (why the police decided not to continue the search that Saturday night, and why none was conducted Sunday, is unexplained). At 10:30 of the morning of the 13th, a private in the search party found Miss Farnsworth, assaulted and apparently violated (later medical testimony was to indicate that there was not conclusive proof of actual rape) some 300 yards from the shop, in towards uncleared jungle. She was not dead.

Commander Hackett directed the search for clues, sent for a photographer, had pictures taken. All this time, no first aid was given the victim. About an hour and a half after Miss Farnsworth was discovered, an ambulance finally came and took her to the military hospital. She died some twelve hours later—about 1 a.m. of December 14. Apparently she never regained consciousness—at any rate no statement from her during this twelve-hour period seems to have survived.

The facts would appear to show that if search had been instituted at once and had Miss Farnsworth been spared the agony of lying out in the woods all Saturday night, all day Sunday and most of Monday morning, she probably would not have died.

It is clear that the Civil Administration of the island hoped to keep jurisdiction of the case and to get a quick trial and conviction and call the matter settled. So far as the authorities

of the Air Force were concerned there would apparently have been no opposition to this had it not been for the timely and courageous intercession of a Negro chaplain, Captain E. E. Grimmett, attached to the Air Force on Guam.

Captain Grimmett, having finally been permitted to see the men, wrote at once to a relative of one of them—Mr. Elbert A. Dennis, then of Indianapolis, uncle of Herman P. Dennis, Jr. He told the uncle of the tragedy that had befallen the men and added: "We feel certain that they are not guilty of the charge; however, they [i.e., the Dennises, not Burns] have been terrorized into signing confessions."

He urged that other relatives be notified at once and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People be contacted so that an effective defense might be organized. Mr. Dennis did this at once, and from then on remained in the center of the struggle to save the lives of the men.

Captain Grimmett, meanwhile, in Guam, began to organize something of a defense movement, too. He asked permission of superior officers to go among the Negro troops and appeal for support of the prisoners and for donations with which he meant to hire a civilian attorney. Such an attorney was contacted on the island and agreed—for the immoderate fee of \$15,000—to enter the case. Staggered by the sum, but determined to go on, the Chaplain continued, with great success, in gathering financial and moral support.

At this point the Air Command intervened, forbade further defense efforts of this nature and prohibited the collection of money. Simultaneously, however, the case was taken out of the civil administration (that is, the Naval Department) and placed within the jurisdiction of the Air Force.

The trials were originally set for March 18, 1949, but were first put off one month and finally postponed until May. This delay was due to a defense demand for a court-martial to be composed of officers from an area other than Guam (the court was flown in from Tokyo), and, especially, to the efforts of the defense to get counsel unprejudiced against Negro defendants, and eager to really defend them.

Indeed, the second postponement of the trial came only because Chaplain Grimmer, on behalf of Herman Dennis and Robert Burns, wired the President of the United States telling him that the men were being denied defense counsel of their choice, and—for good measure—sent a similar wire to the *Pittsburgh Courier*. With this wire, that leading Negro newspaper became interested in the case, an interest that was to grow as the years passed and to reach unprecedented heights just before the final execution date.

But the fact is that the men never did get the counsel they wanted; above all they did not get the services of Lt. Col. Edward F. Daly, then attached to the Judge Advocate office on the island. All the details of this complex story need not be told here. Suffice it to say: Col. Daly (a white officer) had succeeded in gaining personal knowledge of the frame-up character of the case; he had himself gotten hold of evidence implicating other persons whose actual identity he did not know, and, when the men requested his services, he was arrested, charged with ungentlemanly and un-officer-like behavior, confined for mental examination, his papers rifled (and important evidence bearing on this case stolen) and he himself forced to resign from the service.

Moreover, his secretary, Miss Mary Louise Hill, swore that she herself had overheard conversations involving the police and Col. Daly which indicated that the prisoners had been beaten into confessions, and specifically that she had heard the police say that a deal had been made with Calvin Dennis promising a commutation of his death sentence if he confessed and implicated the others. She also swore (in affidavits presented *after the trials* had ended) that the "accusations against Col. Daly were malicious and unfounded, and brought only to prevent him from being defense counsel for the accused." Further:

"That she assisted Col. Daly in preparation of defense of the accused, and that he was in possession of material

evidence in their behalf which was not presented at the Court-Martial, and while he was confined, many of the papers, and other evidence, was stolen from his office and quarters. It appears to her that truth, honesty and justice have not yet reached the Air Force in Guam."

Miss Hill further states that prior to the trial the Government informed her that her services were no longer desired on Guam and that she was to be sent home at government expense. But she did remain behind long enough to testify at the trial that she had personally heard Commander Hackett state that the confessions had been beaten out of the men. Thereafter, a later affidavit makes clear, and even a Review Board admits, the prosecution prevailed upon her to sign a false sworn statement repudiating this testimony, but, getting a conviction despite her testimony, the false affidavit never was presented.

After testifying for the defense, Miss Hill was returned to the States—but now at her own expense! A suit for transportation charges was filed by Miss Hill against the government.

Indicative of what the legal situation finally resolved itself into, is the fact that the attorney for Sgt. Burns—an attorney in a capital case—was assigned at the last moment and that he had never seen the man he was to defend until ONE DAY before the trial commenced! And the "defense" of Burns took 90 minutes; while defense counsel actually ordered him (in the military sense, of officer to enlisted man) not to take the stand in his own defense, though he urgently desired to do so.

The three men were convicted and sentenced to die. Herman Dennis was tried first; his trial ended May 16. Sgt. Burns was tried last; his trial ended May 30.

The trials were held in the Cross Roads Service Club. Cushioned sofas and chairs were provided for the hundreds of men, women and children who attended (about 200 were at the first trial, as many as 800 at the last). Hawkers sold soft drinks at momentary interruptions in the legal rigamarole. Outside, soldiers armed with rifles, one at every

twenty feet, surrounded the Club. Racist hysteria was at a fever pitch.

The convictions were based primarily upon the "confessions," especially that of Calvin Dennis, for Herman Dennis repudiated his confession at his trial. Calvin Dennis did not—he held to the hope of a deal that would bring him release in not over ten years. Actually, however, Calvin Dennis could not tolerate the horror of the deal, and in a private letter (in this writer's possession) written as early as September, 1949 he repudiated his confession, stated that it was extracted by torture (as quoted earlier) and affirmed his absolute innocence. Two years later, in September, 1951, he repeated the substance of this letter in legal affidavit form.

The other evidence adduced in court was of the flimsiest circumstantial kind. One white person testified that he had seen Sgt. Burns and Herman Dennis near the scene of the crime early on the evening of its occurrence. Another testified that he had seen three Negro soldiers, looking like the defendants, on the road near the shop that same evening.

One Negro soldier swore that he heard Burns boast, at breakfast, in the mess hall, that he had killed Ruth Farnsworth. But this could hardly have had much weight, even with the members of the Court Martial, for others were at this table at the same time and all swore that they heard nothing like that statement. (Burns himself later explained that this man had a personal grudge against him, for Burns had caught him in a theft.)

The prosecution produced a piece of a smock that Commander Hackett swore he had found in Calvin Dennis' truck and which it insisted belonged to the murdered woman. But Miss Blackledge testified that the smock was not worn by Miss Farnsworth the night of the murder, and other testimony made it clear that Commander Hackett, or some helper, had most conveniently found this smock under the seat of that particular truck, and still under that seat some five weeks after the act was committed!

Perhaps most damaging to the minds of the officers of the

court was Miss Blackledge's testimony that she had heard Pvt. Herman Dennis express disapproval of the Jim Crow arrangements in Guam, and his belief that the separation of Negro and white was wrong.

But basic to the conviction were the confessions—including one repudiated in court, and the other soon thereafter renounced, and this despite the fact that Miss Hill testified that she had herself heard the Police Chief boast of the violence he had used to extract both confessions.

The Court overlooked not only this evidence of torture; it chose to ignore other details, such as the fact that the men were incommunicado for from five to ten days, while the law in Guam required arraignment before a judge within 24 hours of arrest; or the further fact that none of the men was told of his rights under the law, especially in terms of making or not making statements; or the further fact that it was proven that the prosecution had tampered with and forced into a perjurious statement Miss Hill, a witness in the proceedings.

The Court overlooked the fact that there was sworn testimony pointing to the presence at the scene of the crime, about when it occurred, of at least four other individuals and that none of these had been apprehended. It ignored the fact that the prosecution had not thought of taking fingerprints at the scene—or, at least, had not introduced them in evidence—though beer cans were found near Miss Farnsworth. It ignored the fact that a man's jacket had been at the scene of the crime; that it belonged to none of the defendants and did not fit any of them.

The court chose to ignore the iron-clad alibi of Herman P. Dennis and of Sgt. Burns, both of whom had several witnesses who swore as to their whereabouts when the crime was committed, and who told in great detail, each independently, exactly what the defendants were doing and why they remembered this, etc. We give just a few examples, from the record of the trial of Herman Dennis:

Herman Dennis had testified that on the evening of the

crime he had been to a movie near his outfit and that he had seen a particular picture which he described in detail. He stated that he had met X and had sat next to Y and had asked for a light from Z and had walked back to the barracks with Q and so forth. Then T/Sgt. N. G. Brooks swore that he saw the accused buy a ticket to the movie at 7:45 on the evening of December 11. Sgt. O. H. Clayton, assistant manager of the movie house, swore that the defendant was in the building that night. T/Sgt. J. D. White swore that the defendant had sat next to him throughout the movie and that he had come in around 8 p.m. Cpl. M. S. Scroggins swore that he saw the defendant after the show and that they walked back to the barracks together talking about the picture. That theatre was about 6 miles away from the Jade Shop, where at about 8:45 Miss Farnsworth was assaulted.

All the facts tend to show that the Court was intent on convicting these men and that nothing could have changed its verdict. The whole spirit of the proceedings may be sensed from one paragraph of the findings of the Review Board upholding the verdict in the case of Herman Dennis:

"The court had its opportunity, and persons reviewing the record of trial will have theirs, to judge the weight and credibility of Herman Dennis against that of the Attorney General of the Naval Government of Guam, the Chief of Police of Guam and Mr. Riedel of the Berkeley Police Department, who are men of established character, reputation and integrity."

This says about as clearly as an official document under the circumstances can: Who can take the word of a Negro and his Negro friends when it is opposed to "distinguished" respectable white officers of the law? How shall "law and order" be maintained if the officers of the law are not upheld, no matter how flimsy their case and how apparently water-tight the alibi of the Negro defendant, especially one proven to have been open in his opposition to Jim Crow? The para-

* Sgt. Burns was also quite militant in his opposition to discrimination. In 1947 the Air Force banned the Pittsburgh *Courier* from its McChord Field Base. Burns led in the successful fight to reverse this order.

graph exudes racism and snobbishness and callousness and these were the attributes of the "legal" procedure that condemned the men to die.

As for "character" and "integrity" let us, indeed, offer some comparative notes in terms of the Chief of Police of Guam and Herman Dennis. Lt. Commander Hackett for years was a member of the Chicago Police Department, and then was attached to the police force of General MacArthur in Tokyo, Manila and Seoul. Everyone knows the incorruptible character and the sterling integrity of these police forces; everyone knows their reputations for humane conduct and the model they have offered in terms of anti-racist and anti-chauvinist conduct. We have seen something of Commander Hackett's behavior in connection with the young Negro man, named Herman Dennis, Jr., himself, and we dare to assume that it is the kind of behavior he learned in "handling" the Negro population of the South Side of Chicago and in "dealing with" the "natives" in Japan, the Philippines and Korea.

As for the Negro prisoner—he was all of 19 years when apprehended, so that he had had a long time in which to befoul his character and besmirch his integrity. He began working as a small child living in Texas, and studied hard at night and became a plane mechanic before he was 17. He had, he writes in a letter, "planned going to school and earn a degree as an instructor or qualified mechanic." And then he had hoped to "leave for Trinidad or some other foreign country where I can make something for my family, and in the meantime have freedom."

But he hadn't been able to make it—this Negro youngster in rural Texas—and so as soon as he could he joined the Air Force. And the first notable thing to happen to him in the service occurred in September, 1947 when he was stationed in Keesler Field, Mississippi and a terrible hurricane hit the Gulf region, flooding whole counties, taking many lives and ruining millions in property. About 400 yards from the main-

land, not far from the field, eight (white) people, including two children, were marooned on an island, with no water, no food and no light. Volunteers were called for to cross the 400 yards of swirling water, in hurricane weather, and carry back these eight people. Six servicemen volunteered and among them was 17-year-old Herman Dennis, already almost six feet tall and weighing near 170 pounds and strong and concerned about people dying. So Herman Dennis and five other men crossed the waters and got to the marooned people and brought them all out, one by one, safely. For this, in Mississippi, the Negro serviceman, Herman Dennis, Jr., received an official Letter of Appreciation from his Commanding Officer, Major R. W. Deppe, going through channels, which concluded:

"I want everyone to know that your courage and physical stamina made you an example of what the Air Force desires in its men. If I never had known it before, I certainly would know now that you are a real soldier."

The next year this Herman Dennis, all of 18 now, is in Guam, and he writes home how anxious he is to make good and how he is trying to get permission to go to school and learn more about mechanics and engineering, but somehow all his applications fall through and he cannot make it:

"It is hard to go to school over here. I didn't have the opportunity while in the States . . . Since I have been in this army I haven't accomplish any thing I want; they won't give it to me."

And in January, 1949, as we have seen, Herman Dennis, Jr., is being entertained by the distinguished Commander Hackett, himself. We will let the records of the two human beings be compared and we await with confidence the verdict as to character and integrity, adding only that in prison, too, Herman Dennis showed he was a real soldier, for from it he wrote, in a letter smuggled out:

"I've seen enough segregation in my 21 years [it was late 1950] . . . I am hated here because I tell these people what I think of them . . . I don't let them push me around and

talk to me like I am a dog. That is why I was put in isolation for 14 days on bread and water and a full meal every third day."

All review boards continually rejected the appeals of the men for a new trial. These rejections came in the face not only of the flimsiness of the evidence in the original trial, but in the face of the fact that post-trial affidavits established the frameup character of the proceedings to the full. First, there was Calvin Dennis' detailed and circumstantial affidavit repudiating his confession as being torn from him by torture and bribery. Second, there was the 2,500-word affidavit by former Colonel Daly detailing his personal knowledge of the frameup, both against the accused and against himself. The same affidavit declares that he knows the mail of Chaplain Grimmitt was tampered with and held up by the Air Force and that the Commanding Officer was anxious "to get rid of Crimmitt." Mr. Daly declared that he knew, of his own knowledge, that one of the men involved in framing evidence was a former C.I.D. man who had been fired because of alleged participation in corruption and that he was promised his job back if he performed well in this case. And Mr. Daly stated that he had himself accumulated evidence, since stolen from him, tending to prove the innocence of the prisoners, and that this evidence had been deliberately kept from the court.

Third, there was the 2000-word affidavit of Chaplain E. E. Grimmitt who told of the opposition he met when he tried to help secure adequate defense for the men; who told of being informed by a Marine sergeant that the men were being framed; who told of his phone being tapped and his mail tampered with. In this affidavit the Chaplain swore that he had personally heard two generals declare that come what may the convictions must stand for "we must save the Air Force at all cost"; that he personally knew the prosecuting officer threatened and attempted to bribe the prisoners; that he had in his own possession a written offer from Commander Hackett to Herman Dennis of a 10-year sentence in return

for his confession, but that this document was stolen together with other material relevant to the case; and that the racist feeling on the island was so intense that in any case no fair trial of Negro men was possible.

Fourth, there was the striking fact that Herman Dennis, in his "confession" and Calvin Dennis in his, had each referred to the other as "brother" when in fact neither was related to the other in any way whatsoever, and they had not met until November, 1948, when Herman had brought Calvin a letter meant for the latter and mistakenly given to the former. The clear effort, on the part of both men, in making this glaringly false assertion, was to cast doubts upon the confessions themselves, quite apart from the torture used to extract the confessions and the fact that both repudiated them (Calvin not until after his death sentence had been commuted to life imprisonment; but Herman repudiated it at his trial).

All this, plus the affidavit of Miss Hill, already referred to, did not move any review board or body of persons, including Presidents Truman and Eisenhower to grant a new trial or to commute the death sentences of Sgt. Burns and Pvt. Herman Dennis.

What was behind the frameup and behind the murder of Miss Farnsworth? A study of all the available evidence convinces this writer that the conclusions which Herman Dennis and Robert Burns and Calvin Dennis each independently reached are valid. These men believed and declared (Sgt. Burns publicly in the pages of the *Pittsburgh Courier*) that the island of Guam was a center of a multi-million dollar dope-smuggling racket, plus colossal investments in black-market operations involving tires, gasoline, medicines, fuses, batteries, and a thousand and one other items supplied to an air, naval and military center. They further were convinced that the Jade Shop (the little curio store that happened to have \$7000 in cash in its register on one particular evening) was a center of illegal activities related to all this.

(It is relevant to point out that, in the pre-trial investigations, the owner of the Jade Shop admitted to drug-addiction.)

It is further difficult to believe, given this enormous illegal activity and the tremendous investments they involved, that the police department, if no other authorities, were not deeply involved. All the defendants further were convinced that Miss Farnsworth knew too much and was planning to or had threatened to talk and that therefore she was killed and that therefore the police were remarkably lax in searching for her and amateurish in failing to seek or obtain any real evidence, and in failing to discover any of the four people, other than the defendants, whom witnesses swore they themselves saw at the Shop the evening of the crime.

After the convictions of the two Dennises, but prior to the trial of Sgt. Burns, Commander Hackett urged Burns for the last time to confess his guilt and to implicate the others in the crime. In return he promised him commutation of a death sentence and relatively quick release from jail.

Burns writes that he answered him in this way:

"Why should I ruin the lives of two men whom I do not know? . . . You may lie, use brute force, browbeat, withhold evidence and twist the facts of this case into a complicated mess if you wish, but your nights will be sleepless ones . . .

"As I have told you before, you have handled this thing badly, so badly in fact that I am of the opinion you know who the killer is, and in some way are connected with this crime.

"Why did you wait until Monday to investigate the disappearance of Ruth Farnsworth? Why did you fail to search for fingerprints? How do you account for the lights being turned out at a switch box which was located in the back room of the shop? Only a person who was very familiar with the building could have known the location of the main switch.

"You claim the crime was done in twenty minutes. How could a stranger enter the front of the store, walk past an employe, go behind the show cases of the jewelry to the back room, turn out the lights by the main switch, assault an employe, carry her out of the front door, place her in

a truck, drive around to an isolated area, and commit rape three times, without being seen from the Provost Marshal's office directly across the street? All this done in twenty minutes; a fantastic fabrication of false facts to cover your guilt or incompetency. I am no longer in your jail where you could beat me at will. So there is no promise you can offer or nothing you can do to make me admit something I have not done."

The whole case, the curious conjunction of unusual events, the affidavits, the tortures—the whole congeries of evidence—give overwhelming weight to the suspicions of the prisoners. And when one understands the millions and millions involved in the smuggling and the black-marketing, and the power and ruthlessness of the gangsters concerned, it becomes clearer why Generals were so intent on carrying through this case, "in order to protect the Air Force" and why, despite the manifest need for at least the most careful investigation by people (*including Negro people*) not professionally involved in the services concerned, this was repeatedly refused by the highest officers of the land, including two Presidents of the United States.

From January, 1949 through January, 1954—for five excruciatingly long years of torment—the prisoners maintained their dignity and their courage (with a temporary, and thoroughly understandable lapse on the part of Calvin Dennis).

Sgt. Burns was baited, beaten, put in solitary, starved, tempted—but he yielded not an inch. The fire of the ordeal tempered him, it did not destroy this noble son of a great people, and in this he was fittingly representative of his people who have endured over three hundred years of crucifixion and have developed and matured in resisting it.

Herman Dennis, hardly more than a lad when jailed, similarly never crawled and never begged and never broke, but defied the jailers and grew in the process. His letters from prison—many of them smuggled out—belong in the magnifi-

cent company of literature that has sprung out of the hearts of jailed martyrs.

"It hurts to know you have been convicted for something you didn't do. Even though this is not the first time it happen."

"Dear [he writes to an aunt] I was convicted to Death. It hurts to know you are convicted for a crime you know nothing about, but that is Life. Have no fear, it doesn't have to be approved . . . don't worry about death . . ."

"It is not easy to continue to hold your chin high when your life is at stake. You can never tell what these people will do knowing you were framed and under force at all time."

"I am damn sick of this hell hole . . . Had I told you what I have been doing they would send the letter back, so you can guess what it is . . . I'm sick of being punished for someone else, and I'm tired of being pushed around, therefore, you can guess what is happening."

"I notice in the paper . . . in Los Angeles where the white is trying to prevent other whites from selling homes to Negroes. But just the same they are teaching Japanese democracy when they should teach themselves."

"Where is the justice of the western powers (American white men) so speak about? Are we going back to slavery again, or is it we are still living in slavery, and it isn't anything but propaganda to the nations that the Negro race has freedom. What freedom? Freedom of what? If hanging our people every day is freedom, then we have it. The only freedom we have is the freedom of sacrificing our lives for that of the white men during the time of war."

"I'm so full with anger and grief that my stomach muscles are turning and trembling. I can't seem to get frighten. It just hurt like hell all over . . . I'm trying hard to control myself and keep my chin up . . . It's hard, terribly hard."

He tries to explain in a letter that must get by the authorities, what he is being made to endure:

"You don't know what it is like here—It's like standing away from a wall leaning against it with your weight only on your five fingers of each hand. Try it for twenty minutes, ten, with your arms straight forward if you think it's

easy . . . Oh, yes, my cell is also cold with cracks in the floor."

A month later the youngster is in the hospital suffering from stomach ulcers and pneumonia.

Meanwhile, the campaign for their freedom and vindication goes on. Sgt. Burns and Pvt. Herman Dennis, themselves, help conduct the fight from their cells, suggesting friends, organizations, forms of pressure, petition campaigns, legal steps, etc.

Outside, the campaign is pioneered in by Chaplain Grimmett, and then Mr. Elbert A. Dennis, Herman's uncle. This man, with extremely limited funds, a family, job, and the pressures for conformity so heavy upon a Negro person in the United States in the midst of the cold war, nevertheless dedicates himself with single-minded devotion to the struggle. He writes a thousand letters—to the NAACP, trade unions, the Civil Rights Congress, relatives and friends, Senators and Congressmen, Presidents, Generals and lawyers, newspapers—and of very great importance, a steady stream of letters to the men themselves, cheering them up, assuring them of his faith in their innocence and telling them something of his efforts. With him throughout the fight and contributing herself important efforts, is his wife, Mrs. Claudia Dennis. Of very great consequence is the early and sustained interest of the very powerful *Pittsburgh Courier*. Helpful from the beginning is Mr. Willard B. Ransom, distinguished Indianapolis attorney and a leader of the NAACP.

Legally, the appeals are carried on by the NAACP, with Messrs. Thurgood Marshall, Robert A. Carter and Frank Reeves, of the legal department of the Association, and especially Mr. Carter, fighting hard to secure justice.

The first stage of the legal struggle concentrated on the effort, within the legalistic framework of the Air Force itself, to get a review board or other competent authority to order a new court-martial. This failed and in August, 1951, President Truman approved the sentence of the men, but withheld execution until all legal remedies were exhausted. The next

and final stage of the legal battle was the effort of the NAACP to get the civil courts to order the Air Force to relinquish its hold over the case and to turn the proceedings over to the civil authorities. The structure of the law is built so as to make such transfer practically impossible, but the NAACP pushed the battle right up to the Supreme Court after all lower courts had rejected their appeals.

The United States Supreme Court did hear a plea by the NAACP seeking to convince the Court that it should issue a writ of habeas corpus instructing the military authorities to turn the men over to the civil administration for incarceration and new trial.

In February, 1953 Messrs. Robert A. Carter and Frank Reeves argued this case before the Court, while for the United States, arguing against any process to delay execution, was the Solicitor General in person.

In June, 1953 the Supreme Court decided, 6-3, against the appeal of the NAACP. Justices Douglas, Black and Frankfurter filed unusually strong dissents. Justice Frankfurter distinctly said that "this case should be set down for reargument" and Justices Black and Douglas italicized that "*undisputed facts*" indicated in the clearest possible terms that basic constitutional rights of the petitioners had been denied.

Nevertheless, the whole process reverted to the sole custody of the Air Force and it was intent on hanging the men. President Eisenhower, taking its intent as his order, refused commutation and ordered that the men be hanged. The last week in January 1954 was set for the execution and the gallows were erected out in Guam.

Now the defense effort reached a crescendo, climaxed with the publication in the *Pittsburgh Courier* for five successive weeks, of the magnificent words of Sgt. Burns himself. Meanwhile that paper assigned its managing editor, Mr. William G. Nunn, to personally write about and "cover" the story. The *Courier* threw itself fully and completely into an effort simply to persuade the President to *postpone* the executions until an impartial commission, with Negro members, as well as white,

could review the whole case—a case which three U.S. Supreme Court Justices said reflected most gravely on the administration of justice and one in which basic rights of the prisoners were grossly violated.

On January 10, 1954, Mrs. Robert L. Vann, the publisher of the paper, personally wrote to President Eisenhower making this appeal and requesting permission to discuss the matter with proper authorities at the White House. On January 13, 1954, Mrs. Vann and Mr. Nunn spent two and a quarter hours at the White House explaining what they wanted, pointing to some of the horrors of the case and in turn listening to reassuring statements relative to great concern that justice and only justice be done.

Nevertheless, despite this quite unprecedented action, the President of the United States insulted decent opinion throughout the country and especially displayed contempt for the Negro people and their spokesmen, by turning down all appeals, refusing to grant any delay, or provide for any additional review of the case. He ordered that the executions proceed as per schedule.

And when, on January 27, 1954, Robert W. Burns and Herman P. Dennis were hanged, two absolutely innocent Negro men were executed not by the order of any Governor of some "backward" state, so that the U.S. government could plead that "states' rights" tied its hands. No, when those two innocent Negro men were hanged, they were hanged by the direct order and on the personal responsibility of the President of the United States, contemptuous of the clearly and unanimously expressed opinion of every major Negro organization in the country, every Negro newspaper, of the last minute (alas, too late) expressions seeking delay from leaders of CIO and AFL unions, and the entire range of progressive sentiment in the country. Robert W. Burns and Herman P. Dennis were legally lynched by the Government of the United States, and this act was done in support of the attempted

terrorization and the continued super-exploitation of the Negro people, and in support of a monstrous frameup almost certainly hiding the filthy activities of a gang of smugglers, black marketeers and murderers, with influence and power reaching high into the seats of the mighty.

Robert Burns attempted to send the series which the *Courier* published through proper channels, but he was refused, and they were smuggled through. In a similar manner did this undaunted man get through to Mr. Nunn of that paper his last letter, written a few days before he was executed, and published by the *Courier* on January 30, 1954. Writing, said Burns, while "death hovers over my door," he reiterated, "I have committed no murder." He said he had "always believed in the strength of goodness and truth" and that he had known "nothing but humiliation and bitter suffering for five long years." Were he ever to be freed, he said, "I would slowly crawl around the world to find those responsible for this suffering—the sweetness of vengeance would be mine." And in his closing lines he urged: "Let my people know we are yet in bondage."

It is for us who live to answer this call for justice. It is for us who live to stop this system of frameup and legal lynchings which the state and federal governments of the United States employ as a policy to help the ruling class maintain itself in power and feed its insatiable appetite for plunder.

It is for us who live to demand a re-opening of the case of Burns and the Dennises. We want to vindicate the names of the men hanged. We demand the arrest and punishment of the murderers of Ruth Farnsworth. We demand the punishment of those responsible for the false arrest and the frameup of evidence that resulted in the murdering of Burns and Dennis.

Calvin Dennis, himself, also an innocent man, has been in jail for six years and faces a lifetime of imprisonment. And since he heroically repudiated his confession, one may be sure that unless this whole frameup is exposed fully and legally he will remain in prison for the rest of his natural

life. At last reports available to this writer Calvin Dennis was confined in the Federal Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. His case should be re-opened and re-examined. If this is done by people concerned with truth and justice, Calvin Dennis will be a free man.

The Dennis-Burns case cries out for a complete overhauling of the archaic courts-martial system in this country, with its vicious sentences, its officer-bias, its caste domination, its race prejudice, and its nearly complete independence from civil control. It teaches that in the United States, in civil and military courts, no Negro person should ever be condemned to die under any circumstances where Negroes are not involved in the judging and in the sentencing. The simple fact is that, in this country, the odds against a Negro person getting anything approximating justice from the police and from the courts, military and civil, are a million to one and that elementary decency would require that no Negro be condemned in a capital case without the active participation in the legal process of Negro personnel.

Vindicate the names of Robert W. Burns and Herman P. Dennis, Jr.!

Indemnify the families of those two men!

Free Calvin Dennis!

Stop legal lynching in the United States!

MAY, 1955

Notes from North Carolina

Greensboro, North Carolina

April 17, 1955

JUST SOME NOTES FROM O. HENRY'S TOWN OF GREENSBORO WHERE Junius Scales is being tried under the membership clause of the Smith Act, facing, upon conviction, up to ten years in jail.

Juni, Chairman of the Communist Party in the Carolinas, is 35 years old, and looks even younger. A college girl in the crowded courtroom asked a friend: "Where is he; which one's the Communist?" When he was pointed out, she nearly shouted: "Him? Why, he's such a sweet-looking man!"

Sweet is a good word for Juni, for his looks and for himself. Juni's a sweet guy.

All sorts of people love him. An old carpenter, a white man, stopped him, said God bless you, shook hands and in doing that gave Juni ten dollars. Several textile workers have wished him well. Two Negro workers shook his hand—not publicly, of course—said they knew why he faced jail and that they loved him for his courage and his goodness.

Two elderly women were discussing him, during a court recess—and folks here know Juni, for this is his home. "Now isn't it a shame. You remember him as a boy, in church, with that curly blond hair and those big blue eyes of his? He was always such a kind boy; but he was worrying about the poor too much, and the colored folks, too. I mean it wasn't exactly balanced, you know what I mean? And he took it too hard. Isn't it a shame?"

A star witness for the prosecution is unveiled today, one

Ralph Clontz, a Charlotte lawyer. Big, heavy, well-groomed. Proper, sitting erect. Eager to do the right thing.

An overgrown and unrepentant Matusow. Spinner of fantastic tales, all with great earnestness and righteousness. The most fantastic is the most damaging and it is to say this that he is on the stand—all else is window-dressing. The second time he ever saw Junius Scales, he was told by him that the Communist Party wanted to overthrow the government of the United States by force and violence; that force was the only answer and that ideas could accomplish nothing. And Scales said that the revolution would come soon, how soon exactly he didn't know, but he told him that his daughter (she was then a year old) would marry in a socialist America. (Oh, how he was protecting white Southern womanhood with that one!)

Pretty soon he joined the Party and all the time his salary from the J. Edgar Hoover fund was growing, until he was employed full-time at \$450 per month.

This week-end, to get the Clontz taste out of my mouth, I was reading about a relatively honest witness named Titus Oates. There is a biography of him, by Jane Lane, published in London in 1949, and on page 30, the author explains how Oates got started. She writes: "It was a most extraordinary thing, but no sooner did this young parson [Oates] come into contact with Papists, then they rushed to tell him their horrid secrets."

But there is no cause for despair, for one turns his head from this Clontz, as from stench, and then his eyes fall on Junius Scales. There sits a white man, in the prisoner's dock, before an all-white jury and an all-white prosecuting staff, who was born and grew up right here in Greensboro, and who spent his whole life in the South. A man whose ancestors were Southern colonial judges and state governors and senators and admirals and generals; a man who grasped the truth of Marxism-Leninism and merged himself with the white working class of his own South and allied himself with the Negro people (and who has earned their fraternal embrace) and knows

that in the power and the needs of those scores of millions—and the millions of ordinary folk everywhere—lies the guarantee of freedom, equality and peace.

I write of this the same day that the news reaches us down here that Ben Davis, of Georgia, is free. That which, in our country and in the South, in our day, unites Junius Scales of North Carolina and Ben Davis of Georgia is that which no persecution can destroy. The truth that both independently found and to which both have dedicated their lives is the truth which will help save our country and set all free.

April 19

The government rested its case today. After Clontz it presented one Childs, all of 24 years now. The F.B.I. had gotten its claws into him when he was 18, and ever since he has been informing. His testifying was a surprise—he said he had paid his Party dues three days before testifying. Indeed, a couple of days ago he had met Juni in Chapel Hill and had greeted him warmly, hugging him, and had told Juni: "Gosh, I hope you win your case, old boy."

Here he was testifying for the prosecution. It developed that Juni had paid his initiation fee; this evoked broad grins from the prosecuting attorneys—imagine the silver coming from the crucified one! Amusing, is it not?

This young Childs—an enterprising lad, intent on making good—had gotten the F.B.I. to pay for his education, as it were. It appeared that it was his services as an informer which won him a deferment from the draft, and he himself swore that for the past three years, while at the University of North Carolina, the Department of Justice had been paying him \$100 per month, plus expenses.

Much of his testimony actually tended to disprove the prosecution's own case (when he—and Clontz—were forced, in cross-examination, to testify to what they *did* in the Party, it turned out they helped expose the Ku Klux Klan, or worked to help elect Negro office-holders in North Carolina, or to get higher

wages for workers), but apparently everything was preliminary to his sensational announcement—at a Party school, during a recreation period, an instructor had demonstrated, with the defendant present, of course, how to kill a man with a lead pencil. The witness demonstrated this before the jury, using the prosecutor as his model victim. The newspapers duly reported that Communist schools taught the art of murder!

It is apparent we need new slogans, to wit: Workers of all countries, unite, you have nothing to lose but your lead points!

Now, too, I understand the real meaning of a passage I once read in a biography of Stalin. There it was reported that, early in the Bolshevik revolution, a Red Army man asked Stalin, then editor of *Pravda*, whether or not he should take his rifle to some meeting, and that Stalin replied: "Well, I shall take my pencil."

The whole case of the prosecution was so absurd that one had to bring himself up sharply in terms of its deadly seriousness. At stake are several years out of the young and fruitful life of Scales and the meaning of this to his family and many devoted friends and comrades. And involved here, as in the case of Claude Lightfoot, was the reality of facing jail merely for membership in a political party. Involved, too, of course, is the Administration's effort to smear the whole labor movement, the Negro liberation movement, and the mounting disgust with the witch-hunting role of the Federal Bureau of Informers.

April 20

Defense witnesses made their first appearance today. It is a sign of the turn against McCarthyism that two professors from the University of North Carolina—Fletcher M. Green of the History Department, and Raymond W. Adams of the English Department—were willing to appear and testify to the fact that to their knowledge Junius Scales' reputation on the campus had been one of honesty and sincerity—though at the prosecution's prodding both men added that they felt

him to be misguided. Substantially the same testimony was forthcoming from the Rev. Charles M. Jones of the Community Church in the university town of Chapel Hill. More notable is the fact that another professor sends Juni a check for \$100 and writes: "You are a victim of hysteria and intolerance."

Of very great consequence was the appearance of Dr. Robert S. Cohen, Assistant Professor of Physics and Philosophy at Wesleyan University in Connecticut. Professor Cohen, whose very distinguished career makes almost incredible his youth (he is 32 years old), testified as a non-Communist scholar of Marxism-Leninism.

Speaking very much as in a classroom (one of the courses he teaches is on Marxism) Professor Cohen testified briefly, quietly and clearly as to the universal scope of Marxism, the various sources from whence it developed, its scientific nature, and the fact that it was democratic-minded. He spoke, too, of the growth of this body of thought, how it has changed in the course of growth, and how its application depended very much upon specific time and place. He stressed that the advocacy of violence was hostile to Marxism-Leninism and sought, also, to convey something of the respect with which this system was regarded among all serious scholars and thinkers.

The cross-examination of Professor Cohen was conducted in an exceedingly bitter and hostile manner, but it did not shake the scholar, nor did it cause him for a moment to lose his calm.

Professor Cohen, asked to explain why he, a non-Communist, had testified on behalf of the defendant, said that he believed that any citizen who possessed knowledge that might be helpful to the furtherance of justice ought to be willing to offer it; that he was disturbed by the grossly incorrect characterizations of Marxism-Leninism that he had read about in other cases as coming from prosecution witnesses and felt that these should be corrected, especially where the possible imprisonment of people was involved; that he believed these prosecutions of Communists were a major part of the growing restrictions against civil liberties in the country and that

these restrictions troubled him, as a citizen and scholar, very much; and that he felt the defense of the rights of Communists, as those most persecuted, was most crucial to the defense of the Bill of Rights. The young professor's integrity and courage and learning clearly impressed those in the very crowded court-room.

Then came a moment of high drama. Mrs. A. M. Scales took the stand to speak in defense of her son. An elderly woman, conveying a sense of frailty and clearly under most intense strain, she nevertheless kept perfect control of herself. Indeed, when she was asked where and when she was born, she pointedly chose to answer the first question—Richmond—and to remain discreetly silent about her age.

Her testimony was brief and simple. The mother of three children and a resident of Greensboro since 1914, she spoke of her Junius with love and respect. Junius, she said, had chosen some fifteen years ago to leave his very well-to-do surroundings and throw in his lot with the working people. He had said he wanted to join the mill people, to see if he could take it, and to see if he could help make conditions for working people better. He had always been, she said, for the fellow on the bottom.

With the war, he had volunteered and served four years in the army. When she asked him if he were a Communist, he told her yes and this worried her for as she understood Communism she did not agree with it. And she asked him several times whether there was any truth to the Communists wanting to overthrow the government by violence and he had always said of course not, that was plain silly and she did not think he was stupid, did she? She knew that her son believed in socialism and that he had told her many times he was going to educate the people about socialism and that when enough of them wanted it, they would get it, and that until enough of them wanted it, right here in our country, we would not get it.

April 21

Douglas B. Maggs, Professor of Constitutional Law at Duke University in Durham, testified for the defense and showed informer Clontz to have lied in several respects. Professor Maggs, friend of Justices Black and Douglas, and one of the country's leading legal authorities on civil liberties, was dragged into the case by the prosecution deliberately in a smearing attempt. Clontz swore that Scales had told him to visit Professor Maggs and ask the professor if he would defend Scales should the latter be arrested under the Smith Act. Clontz further swore that Professor Maggs had told Clontz to tell Scales that he would defend him. The professor, on the stand, swore that he had never discussed Scales at all with Clontz, that he had never been asked by anyone at any time to defend Scales and that he had never given any message of any kind to Clontz. The prosecution tried some baiting cross-examination of the professor, but coming out second best every time, dropped their questioning, and everyone in that courtroom knew that Clontz had lied—one more of Brownell's informers caught in the act in the court-room itself.

When the defense rested, the summation began. The prosecution divided their two hours in half, and opened with an hour's illiterate, demagogic, and anti-Semitic harangue by one of the District Attorney's assistants.

Mr. David Rein, an extraordinarily competent and brave attorney from Washington, who was Scales' sole counsel, then addressed the jury for two hours. He showed the whole fabric of falsification, he reiterated the actual content of the ideas and summarized the acts of the defendant throughout his adult life—acts in direct conflict with one conspiring or advocating forcible overthrow of the government. He told the jury of the momentous civil liberties issues involved in the case, and pleaded with them to put aside their anti-Communist prejudices and to bring in a verdict based upon the credible evidence they had heard—doing which they would have to bring in a verdict of not guilty.

Mr. Rein was followed by a hour-long tirade from District Attorney Stanley—a tall, heavy, rather sallow complexioned man of perhaps 45. Mr. Stanley made a rip-snorting, arm-swinging, Huey Longish kind of speech. He was sweating, contorting, striding, shouting. When he said “book,” it sounded like “butchery.” He was full of phrases like: “right here in our own Greensboro”; “strange and vicious doctrines”; “made him sick deep down”; “no honor too high for Clontz and Childs”; “sinister force lurking in our own North Carolina.” He whipped out his pencil and showed the jury once more how Scales had made a murderous weapon out of it; he wanted “to keep this the land of the free and the home of the brave”; he wanted this jury by its verdict to wipe Communism out forever in our own North Carolina. And he wanted to say something else and with this he said he’d be done. He wipes his face and gets right up close to the jury box. “I’m going to say to you something I’ve never said to a jury in all my years of practicing law. I don’t just want you to convict this man, this viper, but I want you to go out of here and to come back, quick, with a guilty verdict. I tell you I want a quick conviction, and I hope you’ll give me that and show the world that Communism has no place in our own North Carolina.”

In an hour and twenty-five minutes the jury returns and says that Junius Scales is guilty.

The judge says he will pass sentence tomorrow. Meanwhile, Scales will be held in jail and the court will reconvene in the morning.

April 22

At 10 A.M. the court reconvenes. David Rein speaks briefly, appealing for a moderate sentence: this is a trial of ideas and in such cases errors are especially frequent; the defendant’s character is good and he has been convicted of nothing previously; he served long and honorably in the army during World War II.

Junius Scales speaks before being sentenced. He talks perhaps five minutes, in a very low voice: I am innocent of the charges and so is my Party. Neither I nor my Party advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence. This trial is a heresy trial, a medieval heresy trial. In this country, ideas must not be tried, and people must not be jailed for their ideas; we must take ideas out into the fresh air and let them be discussed. The prosecution’s professional perjurers have said that I broke with my family and had no use for my father and mother. They lied there as elsewhere. My father, now dead, was a man of honor and loved freedom and though we did not see eye to eye we loved and respected each other. And my mother loved and loves freedom, too, as she understands it and we are devoted one to the other. I have broken with deceit and exploitation and the oppression of the Negro people and that is all I have broken with. Finally, I am proud of my Party which stands now as in the past in the front ranks fighting for freedom and peace and equal rights and the well-being of the workers and the farmers and, ultimately, yes, for socialism.

The prosecutor pleaded for a severe sentence—the man was unregenerate, not contrite and very dangerous.

His honor looked from side to side to see that all had had their say. Then he opened his mouth and said: “I sentence you to jail for six years.”

He denied bail, pending appeal, and instructed the marshal to convey the prisoner to his place of incarceration at once.

The marshal took Junius by the arm and started for his office. His mother, and an Aunt Lucy—she disagreed with Junius, but loved him and stood by him—went after him. The marshal disappeared behind the door, making no effort to hold it open for the elderly women. I opened it for them and we followed Junius.

We got into an office and Junius was placed, at once, with terribly shocking suddenness, in a cage—not a cell, but a cage. His mother asked: “Is that necessary?” I asked the chief marshal if he could not be let out while he spoke to his

mother for five minutes, before being hauled off to jail. "No. Who'll watch him?"

Juni sits on a stool, close up to the bars, puts his nose through and is able to see. He is smiling. Mrs. Scales is perilously close to tears and so is Aunt Lucy, but both gallantly fight them back.

"Juni," says the mother, "what can I bring you in prison?"

He thinks about the question. "Mom," he says, "you know that new translation I just got of Dante? Well, I'd like to have that. And, mom, bring me the two-volume *Joseph Andrews* by Fielding. You know, with the beautiful binding, mom, on the top shelf."

The marshal wants to know if I'm a relative and when he learns I'm not he orders me out.

Several of us wait in the hall. In a few minutes, Juni comes out, handcuffed, and held by two marshals. He looks for friendly eyes. He sees several and mine, too. And in his eyes, as always, a youthful eagerness, a sweetness, a gentleness, and a confidence.

A cold-war criminal, 1955, has been given his day in court and his years in jail. How long, dear friends? How long dear country?

Abt, John, 175, 244
Adams, Brooks, 30
Adams, Henry, 17
Adams, Raymond W., 62
Acheson, Dean, 184, 191,
193, 200, 201, 202, 208
Amory, Cleveland, 109
Anderson, Maxwell, 206
Angell, Ernest, 136
Arnold, John W., 259
Auden, W. H., 126
Austin, Warren, 184, 187,
191, 192, 193, 196, 200

Baldwin, H., 168, 199
Barbusse, Henri, 80
Barkley, Raymond, 59n.
Barnes, H. A., 42
Barsky, Edward K., 206
Barth, Alan, 131
Baruch, Bernard, 110
Baxter, James B., 136
Beard, Charles A., 18,
20n., 21, 27, 31f., 39f.,
103, 142, 213f.
Becker, Carl, 18, 48
Bellamy, Edward, 78
Benet, William R., 206
Benjamin, Judah P., 108
Berliayev, N., 24n., 25, 28
Berle, A. A., 77
Bessie, Alvan, 206
Bethune, Mary M., 138
Bethune, N., 92, 191
Beveridge, Albert E., 190,
Bismarck, Prince, 91, 246
Black, Hugo L., 275
Blackledge, Sue, 258
Bober, M. M., 25n.
Borah, William E., 194
Borchard, E. B., 101
Boyle, Kay, 205
Brandes, Kurt F., 167
Bridgeman, P. W., 103,
150, 160
Brinton, Crane, 30
Brown, James E., 172
Brownell, Herbert, 70,
154, 224, 247, 250
Buchan, John, 27
Buckle, H. T., 18, 29
Budenz, Louis, 180, 147
Bullitt, William C., 199
Burnham, James, 65, 167
Burns, Robert W., 253
Butler, Nicholas M., 26

Cachin, Marcel, 17, 33
Caldwell, Erskine, 172,
206, 210
Calhoun, John C., 59n.,
150
Carey, J. B., 175, 176
Carroll, Wallace, 172, 180
Carter, Robert A., 274
Cassidy, Henry C., 172
Chafee, Z., 131, 133f.
Chambers, Whittaker,
221-237
Cheney, E. P., 28, 29
Chennault, C. C., 201
Chiang, Kai-shek, 194,
197, 199
Childs, Charles, 281f.
Childs, John L., 180
Churchill, Winston S.,
176, 178, 181, 182
Clontz, Ralph, 280f.
Cohen, Robert S., 218,
283

Cohen, Roy, 247
Commager, H. S., 51,
131f., 141f., 149f.
Commons, John R., 213f.
Conant, James B., 137
Connally, Tom, 184, 191,
193, 200, 202
Cooke, Alistair, 223
Coulter, E. Merton, 104
Counts, George S., 89, 180
Cowley Malcom, 163
Croce, B., 19, 27, 32
Croly, Herbert, 50
Crossman, R. H. S., 50
Curran, Joseph, 174, 176
Cushing, Caleb, 186, 87

Daly, Edward F., 262
Dante, 115, 283
Darwin, Charles, 32
Davies, A. Powell, 140
Davies, Joseph, 170f., 174
Davis, Benjamin J., 138,
149, 242, 281
Davis, Elmer, 141f., 152f.
Davis, Kenneth, 171
Debs, Eugene V., 121,
150
Del, Vayo, J. A., 120
Denby, Charles, 190
Dennis, Calvin, 253
Dennis, Claudia, 274
Dennis, Elbert A., 274
Dennis, Eugene, 92, 117f.,
151, 162, 199, 251
Dennis, Herman P., Jr.,
253-278
Deppe, R. W., 268
Dies, Martin, 87f., 148,
168
Dimitrov, Georgi, 92, 244
Donner, Frank, 148n.
Dorfman, Joseph, 215
Douglas, Wm. O., 275
Douglass, Frederick, 150,
242
Dreiser, Theodore, 80,
92
Dubinsky, David, 179
DuBois, W. E. B., 102,
218, 236
Dulles, Foster Rea, 173
Dulles, John Foster, 69,
70, 154, 186n.
Duranty, Walter, 172

Eddy, Sherwood, 25
Ehrenburg, Ilya, 182
Ehrlich, Evelyn S., 234
Eisenhower, Dwight D.,
153, 211, 212, 217
Ely, Richard T., 146
Emerson, Ralph W., 143
Engels, Frederick, 34, 35,
88, 39, 41, 45, 71, 92,
97, 128, 162
Ernst, Morris L., 226,
232
Eulau, Heinz, 50

Farnsworth, Ruth, 254f.
Field, Frederick V.,
193n.
Fielding, Henry, 283
Fitzgerald, Albert J., 175
Flynn, Elizabeth G., 92,
149, 240, 242, 244, 245
Ford, Henry, 15, 78
Foster, John W., 186n.

Index of Names

Foster, William Z., 92,
96, 123, 149
Franco, Francisco,
203-210, 23, 89, 178
Frank, Jerome, 18, 26
Frankfurter, Felix, 275
Franklin, Benjamin, 242
Freedman, Max, 50f.
Freese, Irving, 126n.
Freud, Sigmund, 77
Friedenberg, D. M., 205
Friedrich, Carl, 50
Fromm, Erich, 77
Fuchik, Julius, 92, 109

Garret, Robert, 112
Garrison, Wm. L., 150
Gates, John, 206, 238,
242, 245
Gellhorn, Walter, 181, 184
Gide, Andre, 156
Gilbert, Gustave M., 182
Gilbert, Rodney, 194
Gitlow, Benjamin, 123
Goebbels, Joseph, 32,
108, 203
Gorky, Maxim, 80, 125,
174
Gottschalk, Louis, 43n.
Grabner, Walter, 172
Gray, Barry, 250
Green, Fletcher, 232
Grimmett, E. E., 261f.
Griswold, A. Whitney,
188
Grulow, Leo, 181
Gunter, John, 177

Hacker, Louis M., 109,
112
Hackett, James P., 258
Hamilton, Thomas J.,
204
Hancock, John M., 182
Handlin, Oscar, 67
Harriman, A. W., 171
Harriman, Edward, 192f.
Hart, Merwin K., 91
Hayes, C. J. H., 207
Hay, John, 187, 188, 191
Haywood, Allan S., 175
Haywood, Harry, 98
Hearst, Wm. R., 100,
120, 132, 142
Heaton, Herbert, 26
Heine, H. 126
Hemingway, Ernest, 206,
210
Hendershot, Ralph, 195
Hernandez, Miguel, 210
Hikmet, Nazim, 92
Hill, Mary L., 262
Hindus, Maurice, 172
Hiss, Alger, 221-237
Holmes, Oliver W., 80
Hook, Sidney, 89-103
Hopkins, Harry, 172n.,
177, 181
Hoover, Herbert, 63, 69,
127, 148, 176, 177, 194
Hoover, J. Edgar, 89,
231, 236, 239, 250, 280
Houston, Sam, 105
Howard, Milton, 223
Hughes, E. J., 205
Huie, W. B., 91
Hull, Cordell, 171
Huntington, Ellsworth,
28f.

Ingersoll, Ralph, 172
 Jefferson, Thomas, 71f., 143, 160
 Jencks, Clinton, 247
 Johnson, Allen, 44
 Jones, Claudia, 251
 Jowitt, Earl of Stevenage, 225f.
 Kafka, Franz, 76
 Kempton, Murray, 250
 Kirchway, Freda, 250
 Kirk, Grayson, 211
 Kirk, Russell, 86
 Kohlberg, Alfred, 138, 224
 Krutch, Joseph Wood, 156-163
 Lamont, Thomas, 67
 Lenz, Henry, 138
 Lerner, Max, 50
 Lesueur, Larry, 172
 Levine, Isaac Don, 224
 Liebknecht, Karl, 56
 Lightfoot, Claude, 282
 Lincoln, Abraham, 38, 72, 104, 106, 187
 Lippmann, Walter, 49, 168, 170
 Lowenthal, Max, 236
 Lovestone, Jay, 123
 Luce, Clare Booth, 181f.
 Luce, Henry, 77, 81, 115, 223
 Lysenko, Trofim, 99f., 187
 MacArthur, Douglas, 174, 201
 MacIvar, Robert, 153
 MacLeish, A., 87, 206, 210
 Madison, James, 69n., 60f.
 Maggs, Douglas B., 285
 Maguire, Russell, 51
 Mallin, Patrick, 138
 Malone, Dumas, 108
 Mandelbaum, M., 20n.
 Mann, Thomas, 208
 Mao, Tse-tung, 92
 Marcantonio, Vito, 244
 Marshall, George C., 198
 Marshall, Thurgood, 274
 Matusow, Harvey, 246
 McCarran, Pat, 103, 135, 138, 154, 199
 McCarthy, Elizabeth, 234
 McKinley, W. E., 189f.
 Mencken, Henry, 62
 Meyers, George A., 238
 Merz, Charles, 170
 Miller, Merle, 131f., 138, 237
 Mitchell, Broadus, 218
 Mitchell, M.B., 136
 Morgan, J.P., 67, 124, 191f.
 Morris, Richard B., 232n.
 Mosca, G., 58, 72
 Murphy, Thomas, Jr., 223, 226, 230
 Murray, James E., 174
 Mussolini, Benito, 20n., 22, 91, 181, 203
 Myrdal, Gunnar, 29
 Natvig, Marie, 251
 Nelson, Steve, 147, 206, 233
 Neruda, Pablo, 80, 92

Nevins, Allan, 42, 108f.
 Nexø, Martin Anderson, 80, 92
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, 25, 126n.
 Nixon, Richard, 223
 Norman, Daniel P., 232
 Nunn, William G., 275
 Oakeshott, M.B., 32, 33n.
 Oates, Titus, 280
 Oberholtzer, E.P., 43, 97
 Ortega y Gasset, Jose, 18n., 27, 32
 Orwell, George, 32, 120
 Paine, Thomas, 61, 143, 150, 162
 Pareto, V., 58
 Parker, Ralph, 172
 Parker, Theodore, 138
 Parrington, V.L., 17
 Pearson, Karl, 30
 Perry, Pettis, 247
 Pinchot, Amos, 49
 Plekhanov, G., 26n., 35
 Pollock, Frederick, 30
 Porter, L.C., 198
 Pratt, Fletcher, 168
 Prescott, Orville, 109
 Pressman, Lee, 175
 Pritt, D.N., 102
 Prothro, James, 76
 Ransom, Willard B., 274
 Reeves, Frank, 274
 Reid, Ogden, 190
 Reid, Whitelaw, 190
 Rein, David, 285
 Reynolds, Quentin, 172
 Riedel, Albert E., 255f.
 Riesman, David, 73-88, 68
 Rieve, Emil, 175
 Robinson, James H., 213f., 218
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 168, 172n., 174, 177, 207f., 221, 237
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 124, 191
 Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius, 100f., 224, 236
 Roth, Samuel, 232
 Rothstein, Andrew, 178
 Revere, Richard, 135
 Ruffin, Edmund, 106
 Rushmore, Howard, 89, 247
 Sailer, R.C., 198
 Scales, A.M. Mrs., 284
 Scales, Junius, 278-288
 Schapiro, J.S., 19
 Schlatter, R. B., 31n.
 Schlesinger, A.M., Jr., 115-129, 291
 Seifriz, William, 40n.
 Seligman, E.R.A., 218, 215, 217f.
 Selsam, Howard, 44n., 217
 Semple, Ellen C., 29
 Shapely, Harlow, 132
 Shaw, Irwin, 93, 206, 210
 Sheean, Vincent, 206
 Shub, Anatole, 126n.
 Shub, David, 119
 Shugg, Roger, 107
 Silone, Ignazio, 137
 Sinclair, Upton, 206
 Small, Albion, W., 218,

215, 217f.
 Smedley, Katherine, 21n.
 Socrates, 142
 Sokolsky, George E., 167, 247
 Somerville, John, 36n. 43.
 Soule, George, 179
 Spellman, Cardinal, 207
 Spencer, Herbert, 18, 65
 Spengler, O., 23
 Steffens, Lincoln, 62
 Stein, Gertrude, 25
 Steinbeck, John, 206, 210
 Stilwell, Joseph, W., 197
 Stimson, Henry L., 196
 Straight, Willard, 192
 Studebaker, John, 112
 Sulsberger, Cyrus L., 205
 Sun, Yat-sen, 193f.
 Sun, Yat-sen, Madame, 196
 Taft, Robert A., 176f.
 Taft, William H., 193
 Taylor, Harold, 140f., 148f., 154
 Teggart, F.J., 31
 Temperley, Harold, 18, 30, 43
 Thaelman, Ernst, 162
 Thompson, Dorothy, 206
 Thompson, Robert, 206
 Thoreau, Henry D., 143, 150
 Tillich, Paul, 25
 Togliatti, Palmiro, 137
 Tolstoy, Leo, 174
 Toynbee, Arnold J., 21f., 26n., 68
 Trotsky, Leon, 167, 241
 Truman, Harry S., 118, 153, 177, 197, 200f., 208f., 221, 250, 274
 Turner, Frederick J., 17, 42, 78
 Tytell, Martin K., 234f.
 Vagts, Alfred, 20n., 31f.
 Vann, Robert L., Mrs., 276
 Veblen, Thorstein, 73, 109, 213f.
 Ward, F.T., 187
 Watson, J.B., 62
 Watson, Lowell, 251
 Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 120
 Wedemeyer, A.C., 201
 Weingast, David E., 51
 Welles, Benjamin, 198
 Welles, Sumner, 173
 Werth, Alexander, 172
 Whitaker, John T., 203
 White, Harry Dexter, 229
 Whitman, Walt, 165
 Wilcox, Clair, 131f.
 Wildman, R., 190
 Wilson, R., 61f., 67
 Wilson, Woodrow, 52f., 170
 Wolff, Milton, 206
 Wright, C.A., 232
 Wu, Hsiu-chuan, 184f., 200f.
 Wyllie, I.G., 76
 Yergan, Max, 119
 Zhdanov, Andrei, 137
 Zola, Emile, 221
 Zoll, A.A., 91

From the Introduction

by PROFESSOR ROBERT S. COHEN

Chairman, Department of Physics
Boston University

"Aptheker writes, then, not only within an American tradition of dissent, and concern for justice, but with intellectual equipment new to that tradition, adding, to expose and popular pressure, the Marxist method of casual analysis. There are, to my mind, other reasonable approaches to history than Marxism, and there are other components to morality than justice, but *the point I am making is that the America of the Cold War has denied both that Communism is reasoned and that a Communist can be moral. It is time that we questioned this view. We need to test the reasoning and judge the morality of those intelligent men and women who have become persuaded to the Communist way. . . .*

"Dr. Aptheker's competence is well established. William E. B. DuBois wrote that the *Documentary History* was 'painstaking and thorough . . . a milestone on the road to Truth' and Dean Harry Carman of Columbia called the doctoral dissertation a masterpiece. . . .

"It is not unlikely that in a more tolerant time a scholar of Aptheker's distinction and influence would hold a university professorship of Negro history."